National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

University of Alberta

TEACHER KNOWLEDGE: NARRATIVES OF RELATIONSHIP IN CURRICULUM MAKING AND TEACHER DEVELOPMENT

BY

KATHIE MARGARET WEBB

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL POLICY STUDIES

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL 1995

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services Branch
Direction des acquisitions et des services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

THE AUTHOR HAS GRANTED AN IRREVOCABLE NON-EXCLUSIVE LICENCE ALLOWING THE NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA TO REPRODUCE, LOAN, DISTRIBUTE OR SELL COPIES OF HIS/HER THESIS BY ANY MEANS AND IN ANY FORM OR FORMAT, MAKING THIS THESIS AVAILABLE TO INTERESTED PERSONS.

L'AUTEUR A ACCORDE UNE LICENCE IRREVOCABLE ET NON EXCLUSIVE PERMETTANT A LA BIBLIOTHEQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA DE REPRODUIRE, PRETER, DISTRIBUER OU VENDRE DES COPIES DE SA THESE DE QUELQUE MANIERE ET SOUS QUELQUE FORME QUE CE SOIT POUR METTRE DES EXEMPLAIRES DE CETTE THESE A LA DISPOSITION DES PERSONNE INTERESSEES.

THE AUTHOR RETAINS OWNERSHIP OF THE COPYRIGHT IN HIS/HER THESIS. NEITHER THE THESIS NOR SUBSTANTIAL EXTRACTS FROM IT MAY BE PRINTED OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED WITHOUT HIS/HER PERMISSION.

L'AUTEUR CONSERVE LA PROPRIETE DU DROIT D'AUTEUR QUI PROTEGE SA THESE. NI LA THESE NI DES EXTRAITS SUBSTANTIELS DE CELLE-CI NE DOIVENT ETRE IMPRIMES OU AUTREMENT REPRODUITS SANS SON AUTORISATION.

ISBN 0-612-06308-9

Canada

Copyright Permission from Coauthor

Permission is hereby granted for Kathie M. Webb to submit three papers coauthored with Janet M. Blond to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research at The University of Alberta for inclusion in her doctoral dissertation. Those papers are:

a. "Responsibility and Relationship in Teacher Research and the Construction of Knowledge: Practitioner and Researcher Perspectives" (Janet Blond & Kathie Webb)

b. "Teacher Knowledge: The Relationship Between Caring and Knowing" (Kathie Webb & Janet Blond)

c. "Authority of Teacher Knowledge: Authority of Systemic Assessment" (Kathie Webb & Janet Blond)

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of the coauthored papers in the thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly, or scientific research purposes only. The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

Signed: Janet Blond

Date: Oct 4, 1995

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author:	**Kathie M. Webb**
Title of Thesis:	**Teacher Knowledge: Narratives of Relationship in Curriculum Making and Teacher Development**
Degree:	**Doctor of Philosophy**
Year this Degree Granted:	**1995**

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly, or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as hereinbefore provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

Kathie Webb

R.M.B. Willowvale Road,
Gerringong, N.S.W.
Australia 2534

Date: October 6, 1995

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled *Teacher Knowledge: Narratives of Relationship in Curriculum Making and Teacher Development* submitted by Kathie Margaret Webb in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Dr. D. J. Clandinin, Supervisor

Dr. D. A. MacKay, Supervisor

Dr. M. Horowitz

Dr. B. Young

Dr. L. Ogilvie

Dr. N. Lyons, External Examiner

Date: September 28, 1995

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to Janet Blond and other teachers who spend their lives honoring students' experiences, and in doing so, learning to be better teachers.

Also,

to Danika, Carla, Merryn, Eden, and Jade.

May the stories you write for your lives be stories for us all to live by.

ABSTRACT

In this paper format dissertation I argue for recognition of the authority of teachers' personal practical knowledge. Five papers from my three year collaborative study with a junior high school teacher are presented. This research follows a line of research on teacher knowledge (Elbaz 1983; Clandinin, 1986; Connelly & Clandinin, 1988; Clandinin & Connelly, 1995) informed by Dewey's (1938) philosophy of education based on experience. Narrative inquiry (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990) is the methodology guiding the study. We, the researcher and collaborating teacher, examine our narratives of experience as a means to articulating our understandings of curriculum and teacher knowledge. Our research describes teachers authoring development.

The first paper argues that teacher evaluation by an outside expert is embedded in an objective view of knowledge and notions of efficiency originating in scientific management. The authority of teacher evaluation ignores teachers' meanings of their work. It denies teachers' personal practical knowledge.

The second paper describes the negotiation of, and challenges to, collaboration in this study. Shared responsibility and relationship are central to the collaborative research design and "findings." How teachers are positioned by research is questioned: possibilities for teacher development are limited if teachers are not positioned as authors in research about practice.

The third paper argues for teacher knowledge from being in-relationship with students: relational knowing. Narratives describe the interaction of the teacher's caring and knowing with students' knowing in teaching situations.

The fourth paper discusses the importance of "having choices" in authoring a life and in curriculum making. Curriculum as "authored for" students

and teachers and the consequences of loss of authorship for teachers and students are the paper's focus.

The fifth paper argues that a teacher's practices in teaching and assessing writing are expressions of her teacher knowledge. While the teacher clearly articulates her knowledge and view of curriculum as an active process with students, the authority of systemic assessment denies her meanings and evidence of students' learning.

I conclude the dissertation by examining issues relevant to teachers engaging in collaborative inquiry about practice and advocate the need for a supportive environment where such work counts as teacher development.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The people who have helped and supported me through writing this dissertation are friends. These relationships are valuable to me. It is through relationship that I have been learning.

Without the help of Janet Blond, teacher and co-researcher, this research would have little meaning. Thank you Janet for friendship and trust and for the tears and laughter we've shared. We learned with each other and from each other. You are the kind of educator Maxine Greene referred to when she said we must heed and attend those who struggle for fresh air. With Greene, you also "seek a vision of education that brings together the need for wide-awakeness with the hunger for community, the desire to know with the wish to understand, [and] the desire to feel with the passion to see" (1988, p.23). I admire your courage and feel fortunate to have worked with you these three and a half years.

I have had wonderful advisors who encouraged me and supported me throughout the last four years. I admire and respect Dr. Jean Clandinin and Dr. Al MacKay for the ways they shared their knowledge and experience with me and for the ways they always treated me with respect. They are my mentors and role models. I hope some day to help someone else in the ways they have helped me.

Jean, you have been my friend, confidante and wise owl. I value our conversations and the time we spent together. You helped me to know myself and asked me to open the door in my head and tell my stories. It was the hardest thing I have ever done. Thank you.

Al, thank you for listening to my stories and for sharing yours. Thank you for the space that allowed my tears to flow. Most of all, thank you for the trust in me implicit in your words "You can do anything you want."

Dr. Myer Horowitz was generous in sharing his experience. Myer, I will always be grateful for your kindness and advice when I felt the most vulnerable and so ready to break into little pieces at the beginning of my doctoral program.

Dr. Beth Young and Dr. Linda Ogilvie read my dissertation and offered their ideas and praise. Thank you both for being on my committee and sharing in this experience with me.

I am grateful to Dr. Nona Lyons for her thoughtful comments as External Examiner. I am honored by her very complimentary response and her suggestions as to how to further probe the implications of this research.

Debbie Schroeder and I have read each other's writing, presented together at conferences, shared stories of our families and our struggles to be mothers, grandmothers, wives, daughters, and sisters, at the same time as we struggled to be ourselves and pursue doctoral research that was personally meaningful and at times against the grain. We have journeyed together.

I found a new sister in Jan Knutson, a soul mate and beautiful person. She is full of music. I learned so much from her.

Christina Mader has been a source of crazy humor that I've often needed in the dissertation process.

I acknowledge the support of my friends and colleagues from the centre table in the Centre for Research for Teacher Education and Development, Faculty of Education. We shared our writing and our lives. Thank you in particular to Hedy, Joy Ruth, Margaret, Nophanet, Ji Sook, Sher and Merle.

Chris Prokop and Margaret Haughey helped me to see the sun when I didn't think it was shining. Thank you both.

Dear Carla and Merryn, at last I'm done. I have been a graduate student for the last seven and a half years. This has been a large chunk of your lives too. Thank you for understanding that this was something I really wanted to do and for helping me make my dream come true.

Thank you to my husband Kevin, eldest daughter Danika and family. In some ways being part of family made this more difficult, but I could never have made it without their love.

I gratefully acknowledge the financial support of the Canadian Commonwealth Ph.D. Scholarship (1992-1995). I feel privileged to have been awarded this prestigious and valuable scholarship, without which I would have had to cut short my research. I also gratefully acknowledge the financial support of The University of Alberta Ph.D. Scholarship (1991-1993).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

page

Introduction 1

Chapter 1. Not Even Close: Teacher Evaluation and Teachers' Personal Practical Knowledge
Kathie Webb 23

Chapter 2. Responsibility and Relationship in Teacher Research and the Construction of Knowledge: Practitioner and Researcher Perspectives
Janet Blond & Kathie Webb. 52

Chapter 3. Teacher Knowledge: The Relationship Between Caring and Knowing
Kathie Webb & Janet Blond 80

Chapter 4. If You Lose Authorship: Consequences of Loss of Student and Teacher Authority in Curriculum Making
Kathie Webb 117

Chapter 5. Authority of Teacher Knowledge: Authority of Systemic Assessment
Kathie Webb & Janet Blond. 145

Concluding Chapter 175

INTRODUCTION

I Have Left My Classroom. Why?

> I have been a teacher in secondary classrooms for 17 years. What does this mean? What do I know? I have left my classroom. Why? I have lived and worked in a world which does not value my experience and denies my knowledge. I feel the need to find the words to speak to what I know and to share what I have learned.
>
> I am not alone. There are other teachers who have learned from their practice, whose knowledge is also denied. How can we work together to help others know how we teach and learn and learn and teach? Can we reveal how our knowledge of teaching and learning is continuously constructed and re-constructed? Our stories of practice reveal an intricate relationship between knowledge, practice and experience. How do these inform each other? What comes first? Does it matter?
>
> I care about teaching and I care about the students that I have taught and my present and future students. Does this mean I am a caring teacher? What does caring mean? . . . .
>
> The ways I know teaching are not, however, reflected in the policies and structures that affect my work.
>
> (Proposal for Doctoral Research; March, 1993)

When I left my classroom in mid-1990, I was unable to name the discomfort I felt with the curriculum changes being mandated by the New South Wales Education Reform Act and in anticipation of the move to National Curriculum in Australian schools. For two years as a high school department head, I had experienced and observed continuous and overwhelming change within schools as a result of the new managerialism of "Schools Renewal"

(Scott, 1989) that included curriculum reform in terms of "prescribed patterns of study" and eight "Key Learning Areas" for secondary students (White Paper on Curriculum Reform in New South Wales Schools, Nov. 1989). I knew myself to be a successful teacher of Textiles and Design. For 17 years I taught grade 7-12 students to design and make beautiful things with fabrics and threads, but I had no language of practice (Yinger, 1987) with which to explain or converse with others about my knowledge of teaching, how I knew my students were learning, or the interactive process of creating and recreating curriculum in the classroom. These reforms promoted an "authorized" view of curriculum as it existed in the broader context of education, or at least in the educational policy statements, but that view conflicted with the meanings I had made of curriculum. These reforms were taking away my choices as teacher and taking choices from students.

Four years of doctoral research, including a three year study with Janet Blond, an Edmonton junior high school teacher of Language Arts and Math, have enabled me to begin to verbalize my understandings of curriculum and to begin to speak to what is problematic about the ways the authority of mandated curriculum and systemic assessment take away the authority of teachers' knowledge. Working as co-teacher and co-researcher with Janet has allowed me to observe the details of another teacher at work; the time it took for students to learn, the continuity of her teaching programs and the challenges she faced from multiple sources inside and outside her classroom in curriculum making (Clandinin & Connelly, 1992) with students. Over the course of a school year I saw her students becoming increasingly active in taking responsibility for constructing curriculum and in authoring their learning. I was reminded of my students' responses to having choices. I remembered the students who had become authors of their own experiences. They were the success stories. I

began to think about why and how students' authoring of their experiences happens. I also remembered my story of "Sharon's Coat" (Webb, 1995), of the student who only wanted to receive instructions, to receive knowledge (Belenky et al, 1986), and who did not want to take any responsibility in her own learning.

I began to think about a story of teaching where the teacher "delivers" the curriculum and the students receive information to fill their empty heads. The students I remembered as successful had not learned this way. I began to think about the authority of the story of "teaching as delivering curriculum" and how it authors teaching and learning for teachers and students. I began to think about how that story denies both Janet's and my experiential knowledge of teaching. Prior to my doctoral research I had not openly challenged the authority of this public story of teaching. That I do so now has to do with naming and becoming able to articulate my personal practical knowledge (Clandinin, 1986; Connelly & Clandinin, 1988) as a teacher.

Learning to Research Teacher Knowledge

On my very first day in Janet's classroom I wrote notes about everything I could see. I felt strongly influenced by my reading of Margaret Mead (1975) and Rosalie Wax (1971) and the advice of these anthropologists to write everything down at first, as a researcher doing fieldwork never knows until later what is important. I drew a map of the seating plan in Janet's classroom hopeful that this would later be useful (that was before I learned she re-negotiated seating plans with students on a regular basis, and that this seating arrangement was just one of many). I copied the notes Janet wrote on the blackboard. I wrote furiously to capture the words she used when she spoke to her students, hopeful that later these would give me some clues to her teacher knowledge. I even wrote down the messages to students on the posters Janet had tacked on

the walls. I tried to identify with the atmosphere of her classroom and asked myself, "What do I get a sense of in this room?" I wrote:

> This teacher cares - is prepared to work hard for kids. The room has a sense of design. She is intrigued by beautiful script. She wants to challenge kids; wants to challenge herself. I get a sense that she is trying to open up the possibilities for learning for her students. I feel a sense of the artist, designing and collecting ideas for future designs. There is work going on here. Janet knows these kids. She knows all their names plus background information about each of them.
>
> (Research Journal, Nov. 6, 1992)

During the second lesson period in her classroom that day I heard one of Janet's students say, "Mrs. B., you know what I told my dad last night? I told him that you can't wait to meet him." Janet smiled. She said, "That's true." This might not seem like much of an observation, but the freedom with which her student spoke and the warmth of Janet's smile and reply told me that I had witnessed something. This tiny incident of interaction between teacher and student indicated to me that there were things happening in this classroom that while not so visible were so very important. I would have to learn to see them.

Theoretical Frame: Teacher Knowledge

This collaborative research emerges from foundational research on teacher knowledge by Elbaz (1983), Clandinin (1986), Connelly and Clandinin (1988), and Clandinin & Connelly (1995). Dewey's (1938) call for education based on a philosophy of experience informs these studies and our work.

Elbaz's (1983) research with a high school teacher of English literature provides an early framework for conceptualizing teacher knowledge. Working from Schwab's (1969) conception of curriculum as practical and his criticisms of

curriculum conceived as linear (one-way delivery of information from teacher to students) and Connelly's notion of the teacher as a curriculum user-developer (1972, cited in Elbaz), Elbaz argues for recognition of the teacher as an autonomous agent, active in adapting and developing curriculum and shaped by the experiences of her classroom. Elbaz describes a teacher's *practical knowledge in use*. She describes the structure of a teacher's practical knowledge in terms of rules of practice, practical principles and images. These terms are chosen to reflect the relationship of the teacher's knowledge to practice, to the teacher's experience and to the personal dimension. Elbaz shows how practical knowledge is social, practical, experiential, oriented to situations and shaped by a teacher's purposes and values. She reminds us that our view of the teacher is limited by traditional conceptions of curriculum. Elbaz argues that once we suspend these conceptions a very different picture of teachers' knowledge comes to the fore.

Clandinin (1986, p.18) draws attention to what is unique in Elbaz's study, in that Elbaz attempts to define the form of practical knowledge in its own terms rather than in terms derived from theory. Clandinin emphasizes the epistemological significance of Elbaz's research saying "Elbaz's work on practical knowledge opens the way for looking at knowledge as experiential, embodied and based on a narrative of experience" (p.19). Clandinin challenges the accepted view of knowledge as theoretical and as possessed by experts. She argues that this view of knowledge denies the experiential knowledge of teachers. Extending Elbaz's theorizing and earlier research on teacher thinking Clandinin puts forward a view of *teachers' personal practical knowledge*. Her research with two elementary teachers describes the individuality teachers bring to standard curricula through their beliefs, experiences and images of what they are doing. Clandinin offers a

conceptualization of image as a central construct for understanding teachers' personal practical knowledge.

Connelly & Clandinin (1988, p.25) describe personal practical knowledge as a term designed to capture the idea of experience in a way that allows us to talk about teachers as knowledgeable and knowing persons. These researchers challenge the taken for granted meanings of the word knowledge as "objective, conceptual, or found in books." They argue that a teacher's personal practical knowledge can be found in the person's past experience, in the person's present mind and body, and in the person's future plans and actions. They draw on Polanyi's (1958) theory of personal knowledge to explain teachers' personal and embodied meanings in educational situations. Connelly and Clandinin describe a way to understand curriculum as a situation with a past, a present and a future. They introduce narrative as a way of understanding how teachers make meaning from their lives and experiences in school and out: "Narrative is the study of how humans make meaning of experience by endlessly telling and retelling stories about themselves that both refigure the past and create purpose in the future" (p.24). They suggest that understanding life as educational situations can be a metaphor for thinking about curriculum. These researchers stress the importance for teachers of understanding their own narratives - their own lives - as a means to understanding students' curriculum.

This is the purpose of the collaborative study Janet Blond and I have engaged in: to look at our own narratives as a means to articulating our understandings of curriculum, that is, our personal practical knowledge as teachers.

With the work of Elbaz, Clandinin, and Connelly & Clandinin, our findings in this collaborative study of teacher knowledge provide further support for

alternative epistemological theories that help to portray the ways teachers use and hold their personal practical knowledge: *narrative knowing* (Polkinghorne, 1988; Coles, 1989; Connelly & Clandinin, 1990); *relational knowing* (Hollingsworth et al, 1993, 1994); *nested knowing* (Lyons, 1990); and *embodied knowing* (Johnson, 1987, 1989). With these researchers and theorists, we view teacher knowledge as narrative, relational, embodied, autobiographical, and informed by the continually changing contexts of teachers' professional and personal lives.

Methodological Frame: Narrative Inquiry

Mitchell (1981) acknowledges that the study of narrative is no longer the province of literary specialists or folklorists, but has become a positive source of insight for all branches of human and natural science. He links narrative with knowledge embedded in action and in lives. Polkinghorne (1989) searches to find out what kind of knowledge practitioners use in their practice. He argues that practitioners use stories, narrative ways of knowing, and says narrative is the primary form by which human experience is made meaningful. These claims of the importance of narrative are included with many others in Connelly and Clandinin's (1990) survey of the forms of narrative inquiry in educational studies and their outline of criteria and methods for *narrative inquiry* - the study of teachers' stories and meanings of experience. Narrative inquiry is the methodology guiding this study.

Janet Blond and I tell stories as a means of making sense of our lives, our practices and knowing as teachers. We live out these stories in our practices. We are motivated in our search to better understand the ways we learn from our experiences as teachers and to articulate our meanings of practice and theory by publications stressing the need to hear teachers' stories

of their practice (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990; Cochrane-Smyth & Lytle, 1990; Florio-Ruane, 1991; Carter, 1993). The research design we have developed is flexible and reflective of the trial and error processes we each use as teachers. Connelly and Clandinin's recommendation for a two-part research agenda, the "need to listen closely to teachers and other learners and to the stories of their lives in and out of classrooms" and of the "need to tell our own stories as we live our own collaborative researcher/teacher lives" (1990, p.12), reminds us of our multiple roles as teachers and researchers and the need to pay attention to our multiple voices in this study.

Our sources of data are rich and diverse and have been collected and constructed over the three years of our collaborative partnership. Data include: notes in a research journal constructed November 1992-June 1993 during field work in Janet's classroom; notes from personal reflective journals of both researchers prior to the research and during the three years of the study; reflective journals sent back and forth between the researchers over three years; notes from our meetings March 1992 to July 1995; transcripts of taped interviews; autobiographical writing of both co-researchers; documentation relating to Janet's teaching including tests, teaching programs, school and school board policy statements, her personal philosophy, her surveys of students and parents; stories constructed and reconstructed from field texts; and, papers prepared for presentation at conferences and publication.

Our experience in this research fits Connelly and Clandinin's claim that narrative is both phenomenon and method. At the same time as we have been telling and retelling, writing and rewriting, the narratives that reveal our personal practical knowledge as teachers and researchers, we have also been living our stories as teachers and researchers, and reliving some stories. In this narrative inquiry, data collection, data analysis and writing of the research reports have

been responsibilities shared by both Janet and I. We are both researchers. Analysis of data and writing of the research narratives commenced as we began to write reflective notes to each other on the first interview transcript and in the research journal. Hence, the research process has been ongoing with no clear boundaries delineating phases of the process.

Outline of the Dissertation

This paper format dissertation argues for recognition of the authority of teachers' personal practical knowledge. Five papers for publication are presented. All five papers on teacher knowledge are narratives of experience and relationship in curriculum making. These papers emerge out of my narrative of experience, Janet's narrative of experience and our shared narratives of experience. The papers are presented in the order they were written and so reflect the development of the research knowledge.

Teacher Knowledge Denied by Systemic Authority

The first paper in this dissertation *Not even Close: Teacher Evaluation and Teacher Knowledge* tells of my experience of being evaluated (successfully) for promotion in the New South Wales public school system in 1988. I describe the traditional mode of teacher evaluation by an outside expert and how the authority of this process promotes an authorized view of "good" teaching. I argue that the authority of teacher evaluation ignores and denies teacher knowledge. This paper provides a context for the dissertation. It speaks to who I am, the kind of teacher I have tried to be and how I came to do research on teacher knowledge.

This critique of teacher evaluation and the implications for teacher knowledge emerged out of a 600 level reading course I negotiated over a 12

month period with Dr. Eric Higgs, a professor in Anthropology. We designed a program of reading to enable me to construct a literature review of alternative theories of knowledge. When I completed the reading I wanted to make use of my review of the theories in a coherent paper in order to make connections with my experience and with other research on the ways teachers perceive and use knowledge. I kept writing and rewriting this paper but a focus kept eluding me. Eric suggested I write a personal story about something problematic for me and to use that as a basis for the paper. I wrote about being evaluated for promotion, about the meaninglessness of that experience for me - how I had not felt valued by it. Then I wove that story through my review of three alternative epistemological theories: narrative knowing, relational knowing and embodied knowing. My story gave me examples of the ways my subjective teacher knowledge was denigrated by evaluative practices founded on an objective view of knowledge. Writing my story within the academic paper helped me to see and articulate the connections I was making between my teacher knowledge and the arguments of theorists and researchers such as Connelly and Clandinin, Code, Coles, Hollingsworth, Johnson, and Polkinghorne. I began to understand why I had experienced being evaluated by an outside "expert" or authority as problematic.

> *There was little focus on what I thought was important - it had already been decided what was important. The assessment process was to see if I was conforming to a systemic view of what was important.*

Teacher evaluation as I experienced it, and as it continues to be imposed on teachers, has been authored in such a way as to ignore, deny and devalue teachers' personal practical knowledge and the social process of knowledge construction and reconstruction by teachers and students in the contexts of their classrooms and their everyday lives. I close the paper by suggesting a new

story for teacher evaluation, one which requires a process that allows the meanings teachers have of their work to be shared as well as a changed logic (Lyons, 1990), a new way of seeing and being in-relationship with learners and learning. The issue raised is not one of a new policy but a new way of thinking - a new story where authority must be shared.

I struggled for over a year to research and write this paper. The difficulties I had in writing it and in coming to understand how it fitted my doctoral research, reflect the contradictions and the kinds of internal and external barriers that exist for teachers attempting to understand, honor and articulate their personal practical knowledge. It is very hard for teachers to overcome the forms of authority which inhibit them from becoming authors of their own knowledge/experience. Teacher evaluation, as I experienced it, is just one of the ways "authorities" in education deny teachers' knowledge. The ever present denial of what teachers know or how they know by policies and administrative practices and other recognized forms of "authority" serves to rob teachers of the authority of their experiences in classrooms. The subtle but effective nature of the silencing effect of denial of teacher knowledge was made clear to me in June 1994, when I presented this paper at the XXII Annual Conference of the Canadian Society for the Study of Education at the University of Calgary. I began my presentation by saying that I hoped that the Australian context for my story would not distract us and that in our discussion we would address the issues relevant to teacher knowledge. Nevertheless, one member of the audience, a superintendent of schools, said that my story was interesting but not relevant to the Canadian context as teacher evaluation did not happen here as I had described it. He claimed that teacher evaluation is a collaborative, collegial process and had been in the Alberta context for about 10 years. Before I could reply, other members of the audience contradicted his

claims. Two women teachers from different Alberta school counties described their very recent experiences of evaluation.

Jan, an elementary-junior high teacher of language arts, music and drama, said that her recent experience of evaluation was very much as described in my story. Three weeks before, without prior notification, her district associate superintendent arrived in her classroom to evaluate her teaching. He left just as abruptly an hour later, having somehow determined her effectiveness as a teacher. She experienced no consultation. She said he came in as if from "outer space" and "whisked back out again." Debra, a grade three teacher who has nearly completed her doctorate, with a prestigious Ph.D. scholarship and many publications in early childhood education, revealed her frustration and anger: "I was evaluated in terms of thirty-six categories on a piece of paper and I had no say as to any of those categories. They didn't ask me!"

Jan, Debra and I, all experienced, dedicated and respected teachers in our school contexts, were annoyed, frustrated, hurt and angered by the practices and policies that were supposed to validate us as teachers. There was something contradictory in our experiences of teacher evaluation and the systems' favorable recommendations of our work, but none of us felt free to voice our concerns within the school systems in which we worked. We knew no one would listen to us as teachers. Teachers have no authority. Within the context of a paper presentation at an academic conference, the superintendent had not been effective in discrediting my story of evaluation. But I knew, as Debra and Jan knew, that in the context of the school system he had the authority. In schools and school systems, my teacher story and my teacher knowledge, like Jan's and Debra's, was of no consequence. Teacher knowledge does not count.

Negotiating a Methodology to Author Teacher Knowledge

The second chapter in this dissertation *Responsibility and Relationship in Teacher Research and the Construction of Knowledge: Practitioner and Researcher Perspectives* is a paper co-authored with Janet Blond, the teacher with whom I have been engaged in this three year collaborative narrative inquiry. The paper describes our negotiation early in the study and the kinds of challenges we faced in learning to be co-researchers and co-teachers in her grade seven classroom.

Janet and I tell stories which reveal our methodological design - a design that allowed us to study teacher knowledge and fulfill our requirement that the research process be developmental for each of us. Our stories tell how early in the study we were figuring out how to share responsibility in her classroom and in the research and how at risk we felt. We share our experience of challenging the notion of the "researcher as expert" in our work and critique the way this assumption limits teachers' role and voice in research about teaching. We describe how we re-negotiated the study and how we both came to be authors of the research process and findings. In this paper we show how our research relationship works *and* how the findings are dependent on and emerge from that relationship. We claim shared responsibility in the research process. The relationship between the practitioner and the researcher are central to the collaborative research design and to the kinds of information that the research yields. Further, and in terms of teacher development, we address what is significant about shared responsibility in research with a teacher about her practice.

As we began this research, Janet and I felt positioned by the authority of educational research *on* teaching. We observed a parallel between the way teachers are positioned in research on teaching to the way students are

positioned as receivers of knowledge in the public/authorized story of "teaching as delivering curriculum." We questioned the assumption of traditional research that positions teachers as receivers of university researchers' knowledge. When teachers are not positioned as authors of their practical knowledge in educational research, the possibilities for teacher development are limited. The consequences of loss of authorship for teachers are further described in Chapters 4 and 5.

A Teacher's Knowledge From Being In-Relation With Students

In this third paper in the dissertation, *Teacher Knowledge: The Relationship Between Caring and Knowing* (co-authored with Janet Blond), we argue that Janet's teacher stories reveal her *knowledge with* students - the ways her knowing and caring *interact with* her students' knowing in the process of teaching and learning. Our purpose is to further extend the understanding of teacher knowledge provided by Elbaz and later by Clandinin, Connelly and Clandinin, Johnson, Hollingsworth, and Lyons. We claim that caring is knowing in a teacher's knowledge. Our view of teacher knowledge fits with Hollingsworth et al's (1993, 1994) description of *relational knowing* and Lyons' (1990) concept of *nested knowing*.

From the time Janet and I began the research, Janet told stories about her students. There were 56 students in her grade seven Math and Language Arts classes. During lessons, as we walked downstairs to her computer classes, at lunch and in our talks after school, Janet continued to share her stories, anecdotes and bits of information about her students. I wrote the stories down but after several weeks I realized I had few faces to go with the stories. I didn't know her students. At this early stage of fieldwork I was mainly an observer in her classroom two days per week and still had not taken on a co-

teacher role. Though I had copies of class lists, I knew only a handful of students by name. I had focused my attention on Janet, what she did, how she did it and why. I had not considered that I would need to get to know each of her students.

During my seventh day in her classroom, I realized I only knew those students who had been in trouble or who required specific help. I realized I had inadvertently placed boundaries on data gathering. I commenced research on teacher knowledge by putting a boundary around the teacher's words and actions with a belief that within that boundary there would be discoveries to be made about teacher knowledge. Janet kept challenging those boundaries and my still unverbalized assumptions by telling me stories that were revealing of her relationships with students. When I began to work as a teacher with individual students in Janet's classes, her stories began to have meaning for me. I realized that I would have to get to know Janet's students better if I wanted to be able to teach them and participate in the curriculum they were living out. I began to see that if I wanted to understand Janet's teacher knowledge, I needed to know her students. I wrote in the research journal:

> I am also starting to see the detail in Janet's work - the minute levels of thinking that go into trying to teach concepts to a group of kids of differing abilities, levels of motivation and with differing levels of prior knowledge about the topic. (Dec. 12, 1992)

Janet's emphasis in our talks on the centrality of her relationships with students in her teaching helped me learn where to look and how to "see" in our study. I made connections with findings of research literature on the nature of nurses' knowledge. Benner (1984) and Benner & Wrubel (1989) demonstrated an epistemological basis for understanding caring in nursing. Reading these researchers' work on the ways they validated caring as critical to the skills and

knowledge of experienced nurses highlighted for me the competencies and complex nature of teacher knowledge. I saw that a caring teacher was also guided in her practice by knowledge that came from close observation possible from knowing students and being in-relationship with them.

Authorship in Life and Curriculum Making

The fourth paper in this dissertation, *If You Lose Authorship: Consequences of Loss of Student and Teacher Authority in Curriculum Making* is a reflection of my teacher development as a result of participation in this collaborative study of teacher knowledge. I describe the ways I have come to articulate my personal practical knowledge, particularly my recognition of curriculum as an active process of curriculum making (Clandinin & Connelly, 1992) in which teachers and students engage and share authority in constructing and reconstructing knowledge. Dewey's (1938) emphasis on an organic connection between education and experience provides a theoretical frame for this view of curriculum grounded in teacher and student experiences. Polanyi's theory of personal knowledge (1958) helps me articulate the importance of my personal knowledge as a teacher and researcher.

From reading the work of Margaret Mead, Rosalie Wax and other experienced anthropologists I learned to think long and hard about my reasons for doing research and the need for being clear to others, and in particular to self, about purpose. Mead recalls that when she was a graduate student she used to wake up saying to herself, "The last man on Raratonga who knows anything about the past will probably die today. I must hurry" (1975, p.320). As a neophyte doctoral candidate, I held a similarly narrow perspective of my research as a "salvage operation." I thought that in negotiating a study of teacher knowledge with a practising teacher I was going to describe or capture

in print a kind of knowledge at risk of extinction in a time of profound imposed educational change. Mead explains in her autobiographical book "Blackberry Winter" that with experience she moved on from a limited view of anthropology while others did not and, consequently, often misunderstood her reasons for doing research on Pacific Island cultures. She wrote, "But I did not go to Samoa to record the memories of old people. . . .I did not go as an antiquarian . . . . I went . . . to find out more about human beings, beings like ourselves in everything except their culture . . . that knowledge of them could shed a kind of light on us, upon our potentialities and our limitations" (1975, p.320-21).

Like Mead, I came to understand that my collaborative study of teacher knowledge with a practising teacher concerned the interaction of contemporary issues to do with knowledge, with what counts or is authorized as knowledge and the implications for curriculum and teacher development. As a teacher and teacher educator, I began to realize that in doing research with one teacher, our knowledge of her could shed a kind of light on us, upon our potentialities and limitations, on other teachers and how they teach. I also began to realize that I was shedding a kind of light on me . . . as teacher, researcher, woman.

In telling two stories - one from my childhood and the other of my teenage years - I explore my identity and how my personal knowledge of the importance of having choices in my life contributes to the research findings. I raise "having choices" as an issue in authoring a life and in curriculum making. Through my stories and the findings of three studies, including my research with Blond, I argue for the importance of teachers and students being positioned as authors in curriculum making. I raise questions about an authorized view of curriculum that authors/decides curriculum for students and teachers. I raise concern with the consequences of loss of authorship for teachers and students.

Denial of Teacher Knowledge by the Authority of Systemic Assessment

The fifth paper in this dissertation *Authority of Teacher Knowledge: Authority of Systemic Assessment* is connected to the knowledge claims made in Chapter 3. In this co-authored paper we describe the ways Janet constructs her personal practical knowledge in teaching junior high school students to be writers. We show that her teacher knowledge is constructed from her experience, her beliefs, her stories and students' stories and meanings of experience, and from being in-relation with students. Janet's view of curriculum as a dynamic process in which teacher and students engage in meaning making provides a major frame in structuring her teacher knowledge. In her talk about her teaching Janet articulates her knowledge of writing as a process. We see her emphasis on "time to write" and "continuity" as constructs in her teacher knowledge. Her practices in teaching writing are expressions of her teacher knowledge.

In our work over three years I have identified with many aspects of Janet's teacher knowledge and with the ways she tries to live out her knowing in her teaching practices. Her teacher knowledge resonates with the ways I know writing and my own understandings of time and continuity in writing. When Janet talks of her students needing time to sit and think and plan in their heads, I am reminded of my own needs and the multiplicity of phases in the process by which I write. I also sit and plan, write, think some more, rewrite and rewrite before coming to a final draft. I think of my own writing as a wave-like process with highs and lows, peaks and troughs, and where frequency of waves varies over time. From all outward observations I work in fits and starts. My products or evidence of what I am doing come in bursts. There is not a steady even production. To an outsider it might seem like there are periods when I am working and not working. In/on my peaks I am producing feverishly and I

cannot write fast enough to get the ideas out or the writing done. In my troughs there is no outward evidence of my work. I might be relaxing, sewing, reading, laying in the sun or even sleeping. It might look like I am having a good time and I might very well be. I might even tell myself that I am not thinking about my work. Sometimes I am and sometimes I am not. I know that in these times my subconscious is hard at work. It is doing the analyzing and making the connections that will enable me to do something outwardly productive at a later date - such as to write or speak about the issues. I know it is the outward evidence of thinking that is valued in a broader world, but I value what happens within me. I value my troughs. These are also times when I find out what it is I know, what things mean, what my learning looks like.

I relate to Janet's difficulties in having authorities outside her classroom recognize her teacher knowledge of the importance of time and continuity in the development of her students' writing. In her classroom and in our research conversations, Janet acknowledges the troughs in her students' writing as valuable and essential to the process of learning to write. She specifically chooses and negotiates with her students those practices in teaching writing that are connected and will give her students a sense of continuity as well as choice in learning to write. She encourages her students to talk in class about their lives and the ways they are making sense of their lives as a means to helping them value their own experiences and learn from experience. While Janet clearly articulates her teacher knowledge and the ways her knowledge is expressed in her practice, she is constantly challenged by sources of authority in school and within the school system. Her teacher knowledge of students' needs in learning to write, of what constitutes constructive use of time and her meanings of what counts as evidence of her students' learning, are denied by the authority of externally designed and mandated tests.

In this paper we show how the authority of the mandated tests works to: negate her teacher knowledge; author assessment for teacher and students; and deny the significance of the experiences of teacher and students in teaching and learning. The curriculum constructed in the classroom is denied by the authorized curriculum implicit in the tests.

In Summary

This dissertation argues for recognition of the authority of teachers' personal practical knowledge. The five papers on teacher knowledge presented are narratives of experience and relationship in curriculum making. The first paper provides a context for coming to research on teacher knowledge and describes ways the authority of teacher evaluation denies teacher knowledge. The second paper describes our early methodology and negotiation of collaboration to study teacher knowledge. The third paper describes our findings concerning teacher knowledge and relationship. The fourth paper presents the researcher's personal knowledge and an argument for the importance of authorship for teachers and students in curriculum making. The final paper shows how an authorized curriculum is implicit in mandated tests and describes the ways the authority of these tests serves to deny the authority of teacher knowledge.

Bibliography

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B., Goldberger, N., and Tarule, J., (1986). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice and mind.* NY: Basic Books.

Benner, P. (1984). *From novice to expert: Excellence and power in clinical nursing practice.* Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.

Benner, P., & Wrubel, J. (1989). *The primacy of caring: Stress and coping in health and illness.* Menlo Park CA: Addison Wesley.

Blond, J. M. & Webb, K. M. (In Press). Responsibility and relationships in teacher research and the construction of knowledge: Practitioner and researcher perspectives. In H. Christiansen et al (Eds.). *Recreating relationships: Collaboration and educational reform.* NY: SUNY Press.

Carter, K. (1993). The place of story in the study of teaching and teacher education. *Educational Researcher,* 22 (1), 5-12.

Clandinin, D. J. (1986). *Classroom practice: Teacher images in action.* PA: Falmer Press.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M., (1992). Teacher as curriculum maker. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Curriculum,* American Educational Research Association. NY: MacMillan, 363-401.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1995). *Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes.* NY: Teachers College Press.

Cochran-Smith. M., & Lytle, S. (1990). Research on teaching and teacher research: The issues that divide. *Educational Researcher, 19* (2), 2-11.

Code, L. (1991). *What can she know?: Feminist theory and the construction of knowledge.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Coles, R. (1989). *The call of stories.* NY: Houghton Mifflin.

Connelly F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1988). *Teachers as curriculum planners: Narratives of experience.* NY: Teachers College Press.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher, 19* (5), 2-14.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education.* NY: Collier Books.

Elbaz, F. (1983). *Teaching thinking: A study of practical knowledge.* NY: Nichols.

Fiorio-Ruane, S. (1991). Conversation and narrative in collaborative research. In C. Witherell, & N. Noddings, (Eds.), *Stories lives tell: Narrative and dialogue in education.* NY: Teachers College Press, 234-256.

Hollingsworth S., Dybdahl, M., & Minarik, L. T. (1993). By chart and chance and passion: The importance of relational knowing in learning to teach. *Curriculum Inquiry 23* (1), 5-35.

Hollingsworth, S., Cody, A., Davis-Smallwood, J., Dybdahl, M., Gallagher, P., Gallego, M., Maestre, T., Minarik, L. T., Raffel, L., Standerford, N. S., & Teel, K. M. (1994). *Teacher*

research and urban literacy education: Lessons and conversations in a feminist key. NY: Teachers College Press.

Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination and reasoning.* IL: University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, M. (1989). Embodied knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry, 19* (4), 361-377.

Lyons, N. (1990). Dilemmas of knowing: Ethical and epistemological dimensions of teachers' work and development. *Harvard Educational Review, 60* (2), 19-180.

Mead, M. (1975). *Blackberry winter: My earlier years.* NY: Pocket Books.

Mitchell, W. J. T. (Ed.). *On narrative.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

New South Wales Government. (1990). *Education reform act 1990.* Sydney: Government Printer.

New South Wales Ministry of Education and Youth Affairs. (Nov. 1989). *Excellence and equity: A White paper on curriculum reform in New South Wales schools.* Sydney. N.S.W. Ministry of Education and Youth Affairs.

Polanyi, M. (1958). *Personal knowledge: Towards a post-critical philosophy.* Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press.

Polkinghorne, D. (1988). *Narrative knowing in the human sciences.* Albany: SUNY.

Schwab, J. (1969). The practical: A language for curriculum. *School Review 78*, 1-23.

Scott, B. (1989). *Schools renewal: A strategy to revitalise schools within the New South Wales state education system.* Sydney: Management Review, N.S.W. Education.

Wax, R. (1971). *Doing fieldwork: Warnings and advice.* Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press.

Webb, K. M. (1993). *Teacher knowledge: Stories of experience, practice and caring.* Proposal for doctoral research submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Webb, K. M. (1995). Sharon's coat: A teacher's dilemma of caring and knowing. *Teacher Research: The Journal of Classroom Inquiry 2* (2), 74-88.

Yinger, R. (1987). *The conversation of practice.* Paper presented at the Reflective Inquiry Conference, University of Houston, October 9-11, 1987.

CHAPTER 1

NOT EVEN CLOSE: TEACHER EVALUATION AND TEACHERS' PERSONAL PRACTICAL KNOWLEDGE *

Kathie Webb

Some things you miss because they're so tiny you overlook them. But some things you don't see because they're so huge (Pirsig, 1974).

Following an experience of teacher evaluation in 1980 in the New South Wales Department of School Education (Australia), and despite a favorable judgment of my work, I had feelings of unease about being externalized by the process - particularly from decisions about "what counted." I set aside my unease and accepted a promotion to department head in a large, grades 7-12 high school and went on with my work. I dismissed my misgivings by telling myself that it was "just me." I had passed the evaluation. So what was the problem? My next evaluation for promotion in May 1988 was also successful. The evaluator decided I should be promoted to vice principal. But I felt let down by the evaluation that I had expected would value our work - that of the teachers and students I worked with - but which did not.

In this paper I explore the reasons why I, and many other teachers, find teacher evaluation not only an experience in which we feel unvalued, but an "empty comment" (Brophy, 1984) on our work. I proceed from an assumption that *what teachers know* about their work and *how they know what they know* is important and crucial to the evaluation of a teacher's practice. In my view, a teacher is not a transmitter or deliverer of external knowledge, but is an

---

* This paper is "In Press" with the *Journal of Educational Thought*, University of Calgary.

autonomous and active agent in the classroom whose knowledge is influenced by her/his experience and reflections on that experience. Teachers' knowledge as described by Elbaz (1983) is practical, experiential and shaped by a teacher's purposes and values. Elbaz's work opened the way for looking at knowledge as experiential, embodied and based on a narrative of experience (Clandinin, 1986). I use Connelly and Clandinin's (1988) term personal practical knowledge "to capture the idea of experience in a way that allows us to talk about teachers as knowledgeable and knowing persons" (p.25). I believe, with these authors, that personal practical knowledge is found in the teacher's practices, in the teacher's past experiences, mind and body, and in his/her future plans and actions.

From a perspective of understanding classroom practice as an expression of teachers' personal practical knowledge, I present an epistemological critique of the traditional model of teacher evaluation and ask: *What is the view of knowledge that underpins teacher evaluation?* I argue that the traditional model of teacher evaluation (whereby an outside expert, usually of status senior to the teacher, judges the teacher's work on the basis of system-devised criteria), has emerged from a scientific/objective view of knowledge that does not recognize the ways in which teachers and students use, construct and reconstruct knowledge in the contexts of their classrooms and their everyday lives. Such teacher evaluation is concerned with efficiency and guided by principles of scientific management, including prediction and control. My own narrative of experience of being evaluated for promotion provides a focus for questions and argument. The narrative shared and the literature reviewed reveal that the ways teachers use and construct knowledge are not recognized or valued in the teacher evaluation process.

We must question what counts in teacher evaluation and the purpose of teacher evaluation in order to do it differently - in order to create a new story of teacher evaluation which allows for expanded conceptions of knowledge, and which values teachers' knowledge. And so begins my story . . .

20th May, 1988

A student stood at the door with a message summoning me to the principal's office to meet the school inspector. As I gave quick instructions to my students about continuing the lesson in my absence, I thought about the meanings of being summoned. Something seemed not quite right about the way this evaluation process was beginning. I had asked to be assessed (in reality, inspected) for promotion from department head in a large secondary school to vice principal, but from the moment I completed the application form five months earlier, I had no further say in the process. The inspector came from Head Office in the city 180 km away. As an Inspector of Schools in the state system, she held a position much further up the hierarchical ladder than I.

During the next 25 minutes the inspector took me through a verbal list of what I was required to provide in terms of documentary evidence of my work and organization as well as the lessons and meetings she wanted to observe. A copy of my timetable was returned to me with the lessons marked on it that the inspector had decided she would see. Copies of the timetables of the four teachers in my department were also returned with lessons marked and she asked me to inform the staff as to when they could expect to be visited during the week. Among the list of things that the inspector wanted to observe was one of our weekly department meetings. She had decided which topics she would like to

hear discussed and provided me with a choice of two. I was left to decide which would be the one most relevant for our group to discuss.

The inspector also informed me that the next day she had pressing business to attend to, that I would be left for a day and then she would return on Wednesday to continue the evaluation for three more days. During our conversation I used the word "inspection" and promptly drew a reprimand. "This is not an inspection!" The correct terminology was "evaluation." A further reminder from the inspector stressed that she was there at my request. I wondered at the implications of this remark. Was she implying that I had some control over this process? I did not feel as if I had any input into this evaluation - it was the only way I could get promotion. Finally, I was given the opportunity to say if the interview times that she had selected for us to talk about my work were convenient. Of course they were.

In the background I heard the bell ring for the end of period 1 and I thought of my students upstairs and the things I had wanted to tell them before they left. I wondered that their learning was not more important than this process - I did have a free period later in the morning. The inspector continued talking, still planning my week and hers. She announced that she would be starting to go through my paperwork during the next period and would be in my classroom for period 3. We were to meet to talk again in period 4.

By the time I got back to my room my first class had left and another class was arriving. My heart was sinking. I could not name what was wrong, but I could feel it.

My story details the ways in which the school inspector asserted her authority and maintained control of the process of teacher evaluation: initially

by removing me from my classroom to meet her, then via the verbal list of what I was required to provide in terms of documentary evidence and organization, and also by explicating what lessons *she* wanted to observe. I had little say in setting the evaluative agenda. Being allowed the decision as to which of two topics (chosen by the inspector) our department would discuss in a meeting constituted a token gesture towards participatory decision-making. When I used the word "inspection," implying a top-down approach, I was reprimanded. When I expressed confusion at the inspector's offense, I was reminded that I had asked to be evaluated for promotion.

While I felt something was wrong, I could not name it. On reflection, I realize my negative feelings emerged from my recognition that the process was not going to be participatory - there was not going to be any sharing of power in this judgment of my practice as a teacher and administrator. I was to be measured, but not included in decisions about what was worth measuring.

> *The inspector arrived for period 3 after the class had started and found herself a seat at the back of the room. The notepad came out and I watched her writing. I wondered what she could write as she did not know us (the students or me). It struck me I knew little about this woman and she knew little about me. In the space of four days she would make a judgment as to whether I was a good teacher and administrator. She hadn't asked me anything about the lesson or what I was trying to achieve with these students and did not ask if anything special needed to be known about teaching these students, individually or as a group. How could she know who was learning or not in that classroom? And yet, there she sat making judgments and writing comments that would decide whether I was good enough to be promoted in this profession.*

She did not tell me what she wrote, but in our meeting the next period I sensed she had not seen what she wanted to see. In her comments, a key phrase recurred - "student-centered lessons" - she wanted to see student-centered lessons. I guessed my meaning of student-centered teaching and hers probably differed substantially. As I listened to her talk about teaching, thoughts of fashion flashed through my mind. She wanted to see the latest styles. I had given a great deal of thought to my lessons for this week and had put a considerable amount of time into planning them. However, I immediately threw out those plans and started to develop new plans where the students were "doing things." The inspector didn't seem to know that students "doing things" was only one strategy of many effective teaching strategies I used. Grateful and relieved to have found out early what she had already decided constituted good teaching, I made plans to oblige her.

In this part of the story I express my concerns that the school inspector did not know what *I felt* she needed to know to make an informed judgment of me as a teacher: I wanted her to understand my emphasis was on knowing me and knowing my students as a means to knowing about learning in my classroom. This subjective emphasis contrasts strongly with the objectivity of the list of "evidence" I was *required to provide* and my recognition that the inspector *had not seen what she wanted to see.* The inspector's emphasis was on documentation and measurable objects as evidence of good teaching and organization. My teacher emphasis was on knowing people.

How Does the Literature Help Me to Understand This Story?

Teaching is a process in which a person (the teacher) interacts with other people (students) for the purpose of learning. *"What counts as knowledge?"* is

a question we must ask in order to understand why *knowing people* is not a valued criterion in teacher evaluation. A look at the structure for knowledge, at what counts, reveals objective knowledge (distant from and not influenced by the knower) has high status as knowledge, whereas knowing people historically has been considered subjective (influenced by the knower), and has not been regarded as knowledge. Code (1991) describes the mainstream view of knowledge that informs western thought and identifies the ideals of that view as objectivity and universality. She is critical of the power and supremacy of objective/scientific knowledge and advocates a view of knowledge that addresses objective *and* subjective concerns. In her view knowledge is born out of a social context and even objectivism is socially constructed.

Strong arguments and significant research exist to validate other kinds of knowledge than scientific/objective. With reference to teachers' personal practical knowledge (Elbaz, 1983; Clandinin, 1986; Clandinin & Connelly, 1988), recent research on ways of knowing which helps us to understand and to expand this concept includes: *narrative knowing* (Bruner, 1990; Polkinghorne, 1988; Connelly & Clandinin, 1990), *embodied knowing* (Benner & Wrubel, 1989; Johnson, 1989; Berman, 1990) and, *relational knowing* (Hollingsworth et al, 1993, 1994). This research provides insight into the ways of knowing that were not validated in my experience of teacher evaluation.

Teacher evaluation, as I experienced it, emerges from an essentialist view of knowledge (Code, 1991) that validates objective knowledge and denies subjective knowing. Teacher evaluation by the outside expert attempts to be objective, to measure, to rate, to put a number on, a teacher's effectiveness/efficiency/performance. Neutrality and objectivity are required in order to have validity of findings. While an objective view assumes that knowledge must be based on scientific criteria, Code stresses that this

decontextualized, ahistorical and circumstantially ignorant set of criteria for measuring objects is inappropriate for dealing with human subjects. She questions "a public demeanor of neutral inquiry, engaged in the disinterested pursuit of truth" (p.25). In her view the claims to neutrality of objective methodologies in studies involving humans are highly questionable. Her argument has relevance for teacher evaluation.

In my story the school inspector focused her attention on documentation and other observable "evidence" of my work in order to make a decision about my effectiveness/efficiency/performance. My meanings of my work as teacher, curriculum developer, teacher collaborator and administrator, were not part of the evaluation. While the inspector remained at a distance from my students, from me and from what my work meant to me, I do not believe that her evaluation was made objectively. Her judgment was strongly influenced by her tacit assumptions as an educational administrator. Her beliefs were grounded in a view of efficient/effective teaching and administration. From this view, the criteria by which I was evaluated were developed. The distance maintained by the inspector, her reticence to "get personal" with me is rooted in negative views of subjectivity and a belief that objectivity achieves truth. Code (1991) links such thinking with the origins of scientific views of knowledge: "Implicit in the veneration of objectivity central to scientific practice is the conviction that objects of knowledge are separate from knowers and investigators and they remain separate and unchanged throughout investigative, information-gathering, and knowledge construction processes" (p.32).

My story reveals, however, that I am not separate from my practice - from my knowing as a teacher or school administrator.

> *The next day was very anticlimactic - an extra day to wait out did not seem an advantage. I felt hurt and damaged, my body and a little voice in my*

head were sending me lots of negative messages. I felt depressed and my confidence in my ability to keep up the performance was falling. There seemed no enjoyment in the process of evaluation and I wanted it over with. I knew I was a good teacher and had worked very hard for 15 years. My staff were extremely supportive and as a department we had a solid reputation in the school. I knew I could do the job and that I was worthy of promotion, yet I was not happy. I spent the day feeling miserable.

After a lot of tears I decided to go on with the evaluation. I felt I deserved recognition and this evaluation process was the only way the system in which I worked validated teaching. On Wednesday morning the inspector returned at 8 am sharp. I pulled myself together and the lessons went brilliantly. In every lesson the students were actively engaged in their own learning (as they so often were) and the inspector expressed delight. It just wasn't the way I had wanted the classes to operate that week, or how the students expected their lessons to be - the continuity that was important to us, our focus, had been disrupted to put on a staged show. I knew that if I wanted to pass, I had to meet requirements.

What does "I had to meet requirements" tell us about teacher evaluation? Postman (1993) uses medicine as an example to show that technology is not neutral - that it redefines. He says doctors do not merely use technologies but are used by them: "Technology changes the practice of medicine by redefining what doctors are, redirecting where they focus their attention, and reconceptualizing how they view their patients and illness" (p.105). Isn't this also the problem of teacher evaluation? *"It just wasn't the way I had wanted classes to operate that week, or how the students expected their lessons to be. . . . I knew that if I wanted to pass, I had to meet requirements."* We need to

consider what was required and why. What counted in the teacher evaluation process?

Our department meeting later that week went smoothly, impressing the inspector. That my staff and I were not impressed was something we kept to ourselves - what we thought did not seem to matter. Again it was a staged show. After all, we hadn't even been recognized as able to develop a topic worthy of discussion.

Friday, the final day, came. The inspector had spent the afternoon of the previous day going through the hundreds of samples of student work that my staff had filled a room with. The room looked fabulous, a myriad of garments, soft furnishings and toys, in beautiful fabrics and colors. This represented only some of the work that our students had completed in Textiles and Design classes in the previous four months. There were also books and projects from ten students in every class for each of the sixteen curricula we taught in our department. The inspector admitted the quality and quantity of student work were commendable. I was disappointed in (what seemed to me) her attitude that such high standards were simply expected. I knew the work of our students and the teachers in our department was outstanding - I wanted her to say so. However, my attention was drawn to two students' exercise books, the inspector expressing concern that the spelling lists in the back of one student's book were not up to date. She wanted to know how often I went through the books of students taught by teachers on my staff and that she held me responsible for what she perceived as this omission of duty. Her concern with the second book seemed a petty criticism. I repeated that, for me, teaching was not what students filled their books up with, but with what they could do - their explanations, their creativity

and their ability to solve problems. Though spelling lists were not a high priority with me, I said that the vast majority of students had up to date spelling lists, spelling was taught and encouraged and that I did not find this worthy of much discussion. Our discussions focused more on administration after this.

Following policies, constructing and accumulating documentation, and student bookwork counted, and . . . whether the spelling lists were up to date. These were what my attention had to be focused on in order to be evaluated positively. However, what counted for me was what my students could do, their explanations, their creativity, their ability to solve problems and my relationships with students and teachers. *Why is it that what was important to me did not count in my evaluation?* The answer to this question has to do with authority, that is, with whose knowledge counts. The authority to decide whether the teacher would be evaluated favorably or not resided with the school inspector. But is the authority of the outside expert legitimate? Postman (1993) problematizes our reliance on experts and uses western society's reliance on science as an example. He reveals that we look to science to give us answers to questions such as: What is life? When? Why? Postman's point is that science cannot tell us when authority is legitimate and when not, or how we must decide, or when it may be right or wrong to obey. He argues that it is a "grand illusion" to ask of science, or expect of science, or accept unchallenged from science the answers to such questions. Teacher evaluation also supports a grand illusion - that is, that the authority of the evaluator is legitimate.

At the end of the final day, the inspector informed me that she considered me a worthy candidate and would recommend me for promotion. She reminded me that the process was not over and that I would have to be "assessed" a second time, probably in five

> *to six weeks time. The second assessment would be by the Regional Director, the most senior administrator in our region of 200 schools and over 4000 teachers. It would be a one day visit to the school, with the date to be advised depending on the availability of the director.*

What Is It That Teacher Evaluation Works At?

It is impossible to understand experiences and behaviors without taking into account both the social context and the meaning - the significance of the event for its experiencer or author (Code, 1991). Perhaps, then, teacher evaluation has nothing to do with understanding the teacher's experience and meanings of teaching? Educational bureaucracies would argue that teacher evaluation works. Works at what I ask? One of the standard arguments for the validity of the claims to objectivity of knowledge and the rationale for science as knowledge is that science "works." Keller (1992, p.74) stresses, "As routinely as the effectiveness of science is invoked, equally routine is the failure to address what it is that science works *at*. . . . Science gives us models/representations that permit us to manipulate parts of the world in particular ways." Similarly, we must ask: *What is it that teacher evaluation works at?*

Clandinin (in Clandinin et al, 1993) helps us to see that the knowledge found in practice is not valued at research universities or in professional education programs. She says:

> The highest-status knowledge is located further away from practice. The knowledge that is valued is the knowledge of certainty, not the tacit, uncertain knowledge of the practitioner. However, as many researchers now recognize (Eisner, 1988), our

> work must be situated in practice and with practitioners as we try to understand practice, teacher knowledge, and the ways in which teacher knowledge is constructed and expressed in practice (p.178).

This same problem exists for teacher evaluation. What counts, what is measured, is not the teacher's practice or what the teacher knows from practice, but a system-devised set of criteria. What is valued is external from teachers' personal practical knowledge.

> *It is seven years now since that awful week of evaluation, assessment, inspection. It has taken me a long time to figure out why I went home the first night and cried and why I felt so miserable all of the second day. For all my work and effort and for all the wonderful support of my staff and students I have a one page report from the inspector and four lines from the Regional Director. The reports were both very good. They both recommended me for promotion in favorable terms. The Director's report stated:*
>
> *Dear Mrs. Webb,*
>
> *Following further consideration of your work I now confirm that your efficiency has been determined as satisfying requirements . . .*

It is important to consider the focus on efficiency in teacher evaluation and how it influences conceptions of teaching. The problem with teacher evaluation is not just the process and the way it is imposed, but more significantly, how its ideals serve to frame problems and views of teaching. Underlying teacher evaluation is the assumption that a teacher's practice can be measured, just as the efficiency or output of a machine can be rated. Such assumptions emerge from a management rationale for teaching supported by

modern faith in numbers and objectivity. Postman (1993) claims that in our preoccupation with efficiency and desire to measure everything, we are strongly influenced by an ideology of machines. He traces the origins of this kind of thinking to Taylor's (1911) book *The Principles of Scientific Management* which contained the first explicit and formal outline of the assumptions of the thought-world of "Technopoly" - a term he has coined to describe the current faith in technology and the belief "that a technique of any kind can do our thinking for us" (p.52). This includes the belief that the primary, if not the only goal of human labor and thought is efficiency.

Teacher evaluation, that is, the attempt to measure/rate a teacher's efficiency/effectiveness stems from the assumptions of Technopoly. The problem in treating humans as machines is that meaning is lost. My story reveals that the evaluator missed the meanings I had of my work.

> *On receipt of the reports I did not feel any real satisfaction or sense of achievement, only relief that it was over. Shortly I came to feel shame for what I had put the teachers in my department through in order to jump a hoop - shame for jumping the hoop. I cried because teacher evaluation was so meaningless. An "expert" came in and decided if what I did was "right." The system (which devised the process) assured teachers that evaluation was an objective search for truth. I realized that a judgment about good teaching had been made before the inspector had seen any of my classes or the classes of the teachers I worked with. I cried because this process had not even got close to what I knew about teaching, to my relationships with students, or to what I knew about working with teachers. There was little focus on what I thought was important - it had already been decided what was important. The*

assessment process was to see if I was conforming to a systemic view of what was important.

My utter disillusionment with a process that I believed would recognize and validate my work, the work of my students and the work of our department is revealed in the story. Though I was evaluated positively and recommended for promotion, I realized that the evaluator had not even got close to what I knew about teaching students or working with teachers. What was "valued" in the evaluation process centered on implementing system policies and keeping up-to-date documentation.

The limitations of "looking only for what you want to see" are profound and not limited to teacher evaluation. In her book on the life and work of Barbara McLintock (a Nobel prize winning geneticist), Keller (1983) presents a similar complaint about scientific research. McLintock expresses strong criticism of genetic scientists among her peers for their zeal for quantitative analysis. They were "so intent on making everything numerical" that they frequently missed seeing what there was to be seen (p.97). I draw a parallel here to my experience of evaluation in that the school inspector had already decided before arriving at the school what was worth seeing. In looking only for what she wanted to see, she missed what I felt was important in my practice. "Anything else" I had to say, about caring for students or the importance of relationships, was of little interest or relevance to the evaluator.

McLintock stresses the need to consider other ways of knowing than the scientific view of knowledge. She advises other scientists to "get a feeling for the organism" and expresses hope for a future approach to science which allows "a completely new realization of the relationship of things to each other" (in Keller, 1983; p.207). Noting that relationships were not part of the evaluative

process I experienced, we might ask: *Where is the feeling for the organism in teacher evaluation?*

A story shared by Keller about McLintock's specialized knowledge of maize chromosomes has implications for understanding how teachers use, hold and construct knowledge. At a 1951 genetics symposium, McLintock failed to make herself understood. Her colleagues turned their backs on her work. Keller suggests that McLintock's problem in communicating her findings had to do with her intuitive knowledge and that she was challenging accepted beliefs. At a time when neo-Darwinian theory predominated and operated on the central premise that genetic variation is random, McLintock reported genetic changes that were under control of the organism (p.144). Such results did not fit in the standard frame of analysis. Keller also suggests that McLintock spoke a different language because she had an intimate and more thorough knowledge of maize chromosomes than did others. Furthermore, she had worked largely alone, developing her ideas in isolation and without the benefit of mutual understanding that can grow out of an ongoing discussion with colleagues. Ordinary language could not begin to convey the full structure of the reading that emerged for her (p.145).

Several significant questions about teaching and teacher evaluation emerged, for me, from McLintock's experience: *Do teachers have a knowledge that is special to their experience? Do teachers speak a language not shared by those who evaluate teachers? Is the problem that what teachers may have to say about teaching might not fit into the standard frame of analysis?*

What Teacher Evaluation Misses

My purpose so far in this critique has been to show how the traditional model of teacher evaluation has emerged from how we see the world, and in

particular, how we view knowledge. Drawing from the ideas of Code, Postman and Keller, I have problematized the ideal of objectivity for both natural and human sciences. I argued that teacher evaluation is founded on the principles of scientific management, of efficiency, prediction and control, which similarly derive from an objective view of knowledge. I shared my experience of being evaluated in order to highlight what teacher evaluation misses, that is, the teacher's knowledge and meanings of her/his work. It is appropriate at this point to consider how teachers' personal practical knowledge looks and works as well as to consider that research *with* teachers for the purpose of describing and naming teachers' personal practical knowledge is relatively new.

Three current theories for understanding the ways teachers use, hold and construct knowledge are narrative knowing, embodied knowing and relational knowing. While these "ways of knowing" are perceived as helping us to better understand teachers' personal practical knowledge, it is not claimed here that these are the definitive ways of understanding teacher knowledge.

Narrative knowing. Narrative as a way of knowing has been stressed by researchers working in diverse areas (Bruner, 1990; Polkinghorne, 1988; Connelly & Clandinin, 1985, 1988, 1990). These authors view narrative as the way humans make sense of the world and of their lives. Humans tell stories to make sense of their experience - in doing so they story their knowledge. Narrative accounts of teachers' work (Witherell & Noddings, 1991; Coles, 1989; Paley, 1979) provide insight into the way teachers use narrative as a way of knowing and suggest that narrative is far more important to understanding humans and the meanings of what they say and do, than has been given credence by scientific and cognitive schools of thought.

Bruner (1990) reminds us that there is no one way of knowing about meaning. He suggests narrative is a way in which we might be able to get close

to the multiplicity of meanings people attach to their lives. With regard to my story I ask: *What is the meaning of teaching to the teacher? Has the process of teacher evaluation revealed or even come close to the meaning the teacher attaches to her work? If not why? Why is the meaning not important?* Similarly, Polkinghorne (1988) makes a case for valuing practitioner stories. He gives accounts of investigation of narrative in the fields of history, literature, psychology and the human sciences. His research finds that practitioners work with narrative knowledge: that is, they use people's stories or narrative explanations to *understand* why people behave the way they do. Narrative meaning (Polkinghorne, 1988) is "not an object" available to direct observation, it concerns making a connection between human action and events that affect human beings. In contrast, it is important to note that the model of teacher evaluation described in my story was only concerned with evidence that was available to direct observation by the evaluator.

Polkinghorne reminds us that a function of the human sciences is to read or hear and then interpret the texts of human experience. He says these disciplines do not produce knowledge that leads to the prediction and control of human experience; they produce, instead, knowledge that deepens and enlarges the understanding of human existence (p.19). Polkinghorne's emphasis leads me to question the object of inquiry in teacher evaluation: *Does teacher evaluation function to generate knowledge about teaching? Does teacher evaluation assist teachers or the teaching profession in generating knowledge about teaching?* While my story suggests the answer to these questions is "No", it is important to think about why. Polkinghorne identifies the issues as concerning prediction and control. Narrative provides knowledge that individuals and groups can use to increase the power and control they have over their own actions. But this raises a conflict for teacher

evaluation. *Who holds the power in the current set up?* In validating narrative in teacher evaluation, the power is shifted.

In recent years Connelly and Clandinin (1985, 1988, 1990) have provided extensive research data which support the need to hear, and validate as knowledge, teachers' narratives of their practice. Dewey's (1938) emphasis on experience in education informs their research on teachers' personal practical knowledge. They draw on the work of Johnson (1987, 1989) and describe knowledge as in the mind *and* in the body. They describe teachers' personal practical knowledge as "experiential, embodied and reconstructed out of the narratives of a user's life" (1985, p.183) Connelly and Clandinin note that teachers' constructions of their knowledge are missing from the literature about teaching. These researchers stress the need for educational researchers to work *with* teachers to tell *new* stories of education. This criticism is also made by Florio-Ruane (1991, in Witherell & Noddings). She looks at the language of educational research reports and reveals the ways these exclude teachers and their interests. The reality is that teachers' stories are a largely untapped source of knowledge about teaching.

Carter (1993) also argues for the place of story in the study of teaching and teacher education. She emphasizes that teachers' stories are told in a context and she stresses the need to consider the importance of the context for teaching. Carter reminds us that stories teach in ambiguous ways and asks us to consider what stories are told in the service of. The implications of her work for teacher evaluation lie with her question: *Have we authorized our work so that lives have changed for the better?*

Intuition or embodied knowledge. Johnson (1989) rejects the dichotomy of "knowing how" and "knowing that" characteristic of the traditional argument about what counts as knowledge. In his view the classic theory-

practice split emerged from the view that epistemologically "knowing that" was superior to "knowing how" and that this view has served to separate practice from theory. He uses Dewey to argue for a view of knowledge that is both personal and practical. Johnson says there is a crucial role of human embodiment in understanding reasoning and knowing. In his conception of "embodied knowledge" the body is the locus of interaction with the environment. Embodied knowledge is an important avenue for research into the way teachers develop, communicate and transform their knowledge.

Johnson uses the term teachers' personal practical knowledge to focus attention on the way teachers understand their world, insofar as this understanding affects the way teachers structure classroom experience and interact with their students, students' parents, colleagues and administrators. He advises that new models of cognition are needed to take such a view of knowledge seriously and that new understandings of knowledge create new territories for curriculum inquiry.

> *I had been judged and measured but what was measured was not important to me. It was external to my practice and it left out what was central in my work. I really cared about teaching, but there was no attempt to get at what caring meant or the ways in which caring influenced my work. The knowledge that came from my practice and my life was ignored in the assessment process. The embodied knowledge that had been constructed and reconstructed over 15 years of being in classrooms with students 12-18 years old, teaching numerous curricula simultaneously, was not measurable in a short term visit, and hence was invisible to the observer who knew none of us in the room. The relationships with students, so essential to learning, which were so slowly developed and nurtured were not understood or validated. Only*

the visible products of our encounters in the classroom counted (and if the spelling lists were up to date).

Caring as part of my knowing is strong in my story. While Noddings (1984, 1992) has argued for the importance of caring in teaching and schooling, research in nursing provides data which reveals an epistemological basis for understanding caring. Benner's (1984) research data in the form of nurses' detailed reports present a strong case for validating caring and intuition as critical to the skills and knowledge of an expert nurse. For Benner, caring is embedded in personal and cultural meanings and she advises that the strategies used for studying it must take into account meanings and commitments. Benner's research has implications for rethinking what matters in teaching - if teachers' intuitive knowledge is to be validated as knowledge. The work of Benner and her co-researchers Tanner and Wrubel (1987; 1989) has great relevance to teacher evaluation. Benner is critical of what counts as knowledge in nursing and, in particular, what does not count. My story of teacher evaluation reveals that what counts in evaluation is not what counts for the teacher. No importance was attached by the evaluator to my knowledge of the people I spent my time teaching and working with, our relationships, or how caring worked, or why it was important to us.

Whereas Johnson (1987, 1989) explained a theory of embodied knowledge and Benner and Wrubel (1989) documented specific instances to validate this way of knowing, Berman (1990) helps us understand the controversy that accompanies the body or *soma* as a way of knowing. He reveals that historically there has been a threat in acknowledging the body as a ground for knowledge and that throughout western history somatic (embodied) knowledge has been linked with heresy. Berman is highly critical of the dominant ideologies of western culture, achievement and productivity, and of

ambition as unquestionably good. He says that in modern western culture (in particular) there is a conspiracy not to talk seriously of the ways the body knows.

Relational knowing. Teaching children is a personal and emotional process. Hollingsworth et al (1993, 1994) describe the relationship between teacher and child as a way of knowing about teaching through the senses. These teacher-researchers share stories of teachers' reliance on intuitive modes and argue for recognition of personal and relational development as a primary way of knowing about teaching, which they call "relational knowing."

The epistemological difficulty in valuing "knowing people" as knowledge is explained by Code (1991). She states: "Knowledge, as the tradition defines is *of* objects. Only when people can be assimilated to objects is it possible to know them" (p.39). She challenges this long standing assumption by claiming that knowing other people is a worthy contender for knowledge and says, "The process of knowing other people requires constant learning: How to be with them, respond to them, act toward them" (p.39).

Hollingsworth and her co-researchers help me understand what the distancing of teacher evaluation achieves and why it is so hurtful. The lack of connection between what was considered worth measuring and my practical knowledge should be a concern. I now realize that the process looks at results or evidence of teaching from a perspective that knowledge is fixed; the personal is denied and the context ignored. I ask: *What about the context for teaching? What about the children's lives? What does the teacher know that influences the teaching?*

Features of My Narrative Central to This Critique

I shared my story in order to focus attention on epistemological questions about teacher evaluation. The story serves as a connection between my

experience and my reading. Central to my epistemological critique are the features of the story. In the story the teacher is evaluated for promotion by a person appointed by the educational system, a person not of the school community, not a practising teacher, and someone much higher up in the educational hierarchy. The school inspector decided when she would visit, what classes she would see, the topic the teachers were to talk about in the staff meeting, and what teaching styles constituted good teaching. The school inspector sat in classes and made notes on what she saw. She did not ask for information about the students or if there was anything special the teacher felt needed to be known. The inspector had a predetermined idea of what effective teaching and effective administration looked like. I was measured in terms of those predetermined criteria. Implicit in the story is the alleged neutrality of the process. Paradoxically, the process that was supposed to determine my efficiency/effectiveness allowed little or no space for my voice or my meanings of my work. I was not included in decisions about what was important. And finally, the most significant aspect of the story is that for me, the teacher, evaluation was an unsatisfactory process irrespective of the outcome.

What's The Point Epistemologically?

The paper's claim is that the traditional model of teacher evaluation emerges from an objective view of knowledge - a view of knowledge that is inappropriate to teaching and learning. The research literature helps us to understand that how we see the world and how we view knowledge are linked. Teacher evaluation has developed as an aspect of scientific management, from a need for prediction and control. I suggest that teacher evaluation is motivated by the wrong things. Rather than a concern with improving teaching and learning it is tied in with larger cultural practices concerned with efficiency and

the notion that objectification of human activities is necessary and useful. The view of knowledge that underpins teacher evaluation is part of a bigger educational issue which concerns perceptions of teaching and learning: specifically, how knowledge is perceived in education systems, structures and policies, and in much of the literature about education. This issue has been addressed by Clandinin & Connelly (1992) in their challenge to the assumptions about knowledge underpinning mandated curriculum. I suggest that the traditional model of teacher evaluation may be characteristic of a number of practices and policies within hierarchical education systems, in that it works out of a view of knowledge that does not recognize or value the ways teachers (and students) use, hold and construct knowledge within the context of their classrooms and their lives.

Simply creating a new policy for teacher evaluation will not address the problems outlined in this paper - a whole new way of thinking about knowledge is needed. The problem we face is expressed by Pirsig:

> To tear down a factory or revolt against a government . . . because it is a system is to attack effects rather than causes; and so long as the attack is on effects only, no change is possible. . . . and if a factory is torn down but the rationality which produced it is left standing, then that rationality will simply produce another factory (p.102).

We need to ask ourselves: *What if the rationality that produced teacher evaluation is left standing?*

Let's Imagine a Story of Teacher Evaluation That Would Be Different

What could teacher evaluation look like if what teachers know was taken seriously? Imagining a different story of teacher evaluation, one which values teacher knowledge, requires a different view of knowledge than that which informs the traditional model of evaluation by the "outside expert." A view of knowledge which includes and values subjectivity, a view which values the personal stories of teachers about their practice and the ways in which they construct and reconstruct their knowledge of teaching and learning is required. Knowing other people would be considered a worthy contender for knowledge and teacher/student as well as teacher/teacher relationships would be validated as central to the learning process. A new story of teacher evaluation requires a process which allows the meanings teachers have of their work to be shared. New structures and policies which would facilitate this process would be needed.

Recognizing that an objective view of knowledge puts severe limits on what we can know about teaching and learning is central to imagining a new story of teacher evaluation. Understanding knowledge as at once objective *and* subjective and teachers' knowledge as constructed from personal narratives, from the senses, and from knowing people is an expanded and different view of knowledge, to the traditional view which allocates objectivity highest status. Rethinking teacher evaluation to value teachers' personal practical knowledge, requires an enlarged conception of what counts as knowledge and recognition of teachers and students as knowledge creators as a starting point. Also required for a new story of teacher evaluation is a changed logic, what Lyons (1990) has described as - *a new way of seeing and being in relationship with learners and learning* .

This new story of teacher evaluation emerges from a view that the scope of epistemological inquiry has been too narrowly defined and that we need to think about how we view knowledge, about what counts as knowledge and the language we use to describe knowledge. Code (1991), in arguing for a broader conception of knowledge, has said that we need to challenge the structures for knowledge, to transform the terms of the discourse and begin "remapping the epistemic terrain" (p.323). This is what a new story of teacher evaluation needs to do.

A new story of evaluation needs to recognize that a hierarchical power imbalance is inappropriate and should look to ways of teachers working together to give an account of themselves and how they make sense of their work. Power is shared rather than controlled in a story where teachers are seen as knowledgeable about their practices and when structures are developed to include what teachers have to say in decisions about "what counts." This new story of teacher evaluation must not silence the teacher's voice and needs to allow all participants in the evaluation process to contribute. Mishler (1986), commenting on research interviewing, suggested that we need to hear teachers' stories and invite them to collaborate, to share and control, and together to understand what the stories are about. His advice to educational researchers is also pertinent to educational administrators who currently control the process of teacher evaluation.

In imagining a new story of teacher evaluation, however, we must be wary of falling back on old patterns. It is possible to change the way evaluation is done without changing what is at the root of the problem - the view of knowledge out of which teacher evaluation emerges. Shifting who the evaluator is does not change the view of knowledge.

Conclusion

Capra (1988), a theoretical physicist, asks: What's paradoxical about physics as a field of study? He uses Heisenberg's uncertainty principle to demonstrate that there is no objectivity in physics. Capra's concern is with the way we view the world including an economic rationale for education. He argues that efficiency and productivity have become distorted and asks, "Efficiency for whom?" (p.253). Similarly, this epistemological critique points to an essential paradox in the traditional model of teacher evaluation and argues that evaluation by the outside expert emerges from an objective view of knowledge which does not recognize or value teachers' personal practical knowledge. If we are to create a new story for teacher evaluation, one which values teachers' knowledge, we must remember to ask Carter's question: *Have we authored our work in such a way that lives have changed for the better? (1993, p.11)*

Acknowledgment:

I am indebted to Dr. Eric Higgs (Asst. Professor, Department of Anthropology, University of Alberta) for his encouragement and advice in the preparation of this paper and particularly for directing my attention to the work of Code, Postman and Berman.

Bibliography

Benner, P. (1984). *From novice to expert: Excellence and power in clinical nursing practice.* Menlo Park, CA: Addison-Wesley.

Benner, P., & Tanner, C. (1987). Clinical judgment: How expert nurses use intuition. *American Journal of Nursing, 87* (1), 22-31.

Benner, P., & Wrubel, J. (1989). *The primacy of caring: Stress and coping in health and illness.* Menlo Park CA: Addison Wesley.

Berman, M. (1990). *Coming to our senses: Body and spirit in the hidden history of the west.* NY: Bantam.

Brophy, V. (1984). *Evaluation as empty comment.* Unpublished Master of Education Thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton AB.

Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of meaning.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Capra, F. (1988). *Uncommon wisdom: Conversations with remarkable people.* NY: Bantam.

Carter, K. (1993). The place of story in the study of teaching and teacher education. *Educational Researcher, 22* (1), 5-12.

Clandinin, D. J. (1986). *Classroom practice: Teacher images in action.* PA: Falmer Press.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1992). Teacher as curriculum maker. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum,* American Educational Research Assoc. NY: MacMillan, 363-401.

Clandinin, D. J., Davies, A., Hogan., P., & Kennard, B. (Eds.). (1993). *Learning to teach, teaching to learn: Stories of collaboration in teacher education.* NY: Teachers College.

Code, L. (1991). *What can she know: Feminist theory and the construction of knowledge.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University press.

Coles, R. (1989). *The call of stories.* NY: Houghton Mifflin.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1985). Personal practical knowledge and the modes of knowing: Relevance for teaching and learning. In E. Eisner (Ed.), *Learning and teaching the ways of knowing.* IL: University of Chicago Press. 174-198.

Connelly F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1988). *Teachers as curriculum planners: Narratives of experience.* NY: Teachers College Press.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher, 19* (5), 2-14.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education.* NY: Collier Books.

Florio-Ruane, S. (1991). Conversation and narrative in collaborative research. In C. Witherell, & N. Noddings (Eds.), *Stories lives tell: Narrative and dialogue in education.* NY: Teachers College Press (234-256).

Hollingsworth S., Dybdahl, M., & Minarik, L. T. (1993). By chart and chance and passion: The importance of relational knowing in learning to teach. *Curriculum Inquiry 23(1),* 5-35.

Hollingsworth, S., Cody, A., Davis-Smallwood, J., Dybdahl, M., Gallagher, P., Gallego, M., Maestre, T., Minarik, L. T., Raffel, L., Standerford, N. S., & Teel, K. M. (1994). *Teacher research and urban literacy education: Lessons and conversations in a feminist key.* NY: Teachers College Press.

Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination and reasoning.* IL: University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, M. (1989). Embodied knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry, 19,* (4), 361-377.

Keller, E. F. (1983). *A feeling for the organism.* NY: W. H. Freeman.

Keller, E. F. (1992). *Secrets of life, secrets of death: Essays on language, gender and science.* NY: Routledge.

Lyons, N. (1990). Dilemmas of knowing: Ethical and epistemological dimensions of teachers' work and development. *Harvard Educational Review, 60* (2), 19-180.

Mishler, E. G. (1986). *Research interviewing: Context and narrative.* MA: Harvard University Press.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education.* CA: University of California Press.

Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education.* NY: Teachers College Press.

Paley, V. (1979). *White teacher.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pirsig, R. M. (1974). *Zen and the art of motorcycle maintenance: An inquiry into values.* NY: Morrow Quill.

Polkinghorne, D. (1988). *Narrative knowing in the human sciences.* NY: SUNY Press.

Postman, N. (1993). *Technopoly: The surrender of culture to technology.* NY: Vintage Books.

Witherell, C., & Noddings, N. (Eds.). (1991). *Stories lives tell: Narrative and dialogue in education.* NY: Teachers College Press.

CHAPTER 2

RESPONSIBILITY AND RELATIONSHIP IN TEACHER RESEARCH AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF KNOWLEDGE: PRACTITIONER AND RESEARCHER PERSPECTIVES *

Janet Blond and Kathie Webb

New ways of thinking about knowledge have relevance not only for conceptions of curriculum and, hence, teaching and learning, but also for educational research - in particular teacher research - that is, research by and with teachers. In this paper we describe how *shared responsibility* in the research process and *the relationship between the practitioner and the researcher* are central to the collaborative research design and to the kind of information that the research yields.

Our research is concerned with who produces knowledge about teaching and with the nature of that knowledge. We question what counts as knowledge. Our findings have implications for research on teaching, in particular the design of research methodologies which are meaningful to, and include, teachers. In this paper we describe how our research relationship works *and* how the findings are dependent on, and emerge from, that relationship. We share research stories in order to make explicit the way in which we collect information and interpret our findings. These stories reflect our narrative knowing (Bruner, 1990; Polkinghorne, 1988; Connelly & Clandinin, 1990) and the ways in which we story and restory our experiences and our knowing.

---

* Book chapter (In Press) in H. Christiansen et al (Eds.) . *Recreating relationships: Collaboration and educational reform.* NY: SUNY Press.

Collaborative Narrative Inquiry

We are two teachers who first met in March 1992 and started to talk about negotiating a collaborative study on teacher knowledge. We were both active in our development and shared a common interest in wanting to understand more about our own knowing as teachers. Janet is a junior high teacher of language arts/math and has been teaching for nine years in Edmonton, Alberta. She sees herself as knowledgeable about teaching 12 and 13 year olds. Our study is concerned with exploring her teaching practices as expressions of her knowing. Kathie is completing her fourth year as a doctoral candidate at a Canadian university. She taught grades 7-12 in Australian schools for 17 years, including 10 years as a department head in a large secondary school, before coming to Canada to pursue doctoral studies. Her long experience of working in a team with fellow teachers at department and whole school levels resulted in a commitment to collaboration for teacher development.

A commitment to collaborative teacher development is reflected in the research design we negotiated. Part of our commitment to each other involves respecting each other's voice. We continuously re-negotiated the study in order to include and honor Janet's meanings, Kathie's meanings, as well as new meanings we have come to jointly as a consequence of collaboration. We have different experiences in and of the study and we tell different stories about the same event. Hence, in writing about our collaboration we have chosen to use a format which allows us to represent both our voices.

In early November 1992 Kathie commenced fieldwork, visiting Janet's classroom at first two days per week and later four days per week. With Janet's consent, she wanted to be both a researcher and a co-teacher in Janet's classroom over the remainder of the school year. At that time, both co-researchers agreed that Kathie would assume the major responsibility for

writing the final report of the study and that Janet's major responsibility was to be the teacher in the classroom. Though we were unsure as to how we would interpret "collaboration," we established very early in our relationship that we wanted to share in decisions about what constituted data for the study and the meanings/interpretation of the data. We discussed the philosophy underpinning narrative inquiry (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990) and shared our common belief in the importance of teachers' stories about their practices. We both felt confident that our stories would teach us and be a source of our learning, even though we were unsure as to how this research methodology would unfold for us.

Our intent was (and is) to tell and understand practitioner and researcher stories of teaching practice and to make educational research meaningful for teachers and researchers by grounding it in everyday classroom realities. The need to pay attention to the stories teachers are living and telling in their classrooms has been addressed by Connelly and Clandinin (1990), Florio-Ruane (1991), Cochrane-Smith & Lytle (1990), and Carter (1993). These authors describe teachers' stories as a largely untapped source of information about teaching. Florio-Ruane is critical of much educational research saying that it often loses sight of the insider perspective - that it fails to "ring true" to the experiences of teachers. Further, Cochrane-Smith and Lytle (1993) make a strong case for why teachers should participate in research on teaching. With specific reference to the Handbook of Research on Teaching (Wittrock, 1986) these authors state that missing from this knowledge base for teaching are the voices of teachers themselves, questions teachers ask, and the interpretive frames teachers use to understand and improve their own classroom practices (p. 7).

We interpret our research as collaborative, in that it is research *with* rather than *on* a teacher. The analysis of data, constructing the meanings of the stories, has been a joint process where a researcher-teacher and a teacher-researcher have worked together to understand the meanings of the stories. In the three and a half years we have worked together, inside and outside of Janet's classroom, we have helped each other with *what we know* and *how we know what we know* about teaching and learning. It has been a two way sharing of information and ideas. Our research relationship and the ways in which we have shared responsibility in and for the research have influenced the findings - what we know and what we can help others to know.

We share stories from early in our study that describe our continuous negotiation and our vulnerabilities in order to show how the methodology hinges on relationship in collaborative research. We draw attention to the multiple perspectives of events and multiple tellings and interpretations of stories that occurred in our study. We suggest these various tellings and retellings are "multiple truths" (Rorty, 1991). With Cole and Knowles (1993), we argue for recognition of the epistemological perspective in which collaborative research into teacher development is situated. In telling stories from the research and how we are making sense of them, we are describing how we are authoring our development as teachers. We are showing how collaborative teacher research has the potential to change conceptions of teacher development.

Practitioner-Researcher Relationship as Central to Collaborative Research

On November 11, 1993 we met to talk about and start writing this paper concerning relationship and shared responsibility as emergent themes in our collaborative methodology. We tossed around ideas about how we should

start, what to include, and asked each other questions about what we thought was important. Janet suggested the "parent-visitor story"[1] should be included. Kathie agreed that she thought it was important to the paper's focus but was surprised that Janet seemed positive about the story. Janet said the parent-visitor story created a turning point in the research for her. She explained that up to that point she had felt relatively insecure in the research and the research relationship. When she read the parent-visitor story she realized that Kathie was supportive of her. She said to Kathie: "Knowing that changed things. I knew then that I could trust you."

Janet: At first, it was a bit stressful having someone in my room that didn't know the kids or me that well. I was worried about what she'd think: *Were my lesson plans okay? How would she judge me? What would parents think about all these people in my classroom? (I also had two student teachers for five weeks during the first term of the study.) Would she write about my messy desk? What about those days when I wasn't the perfect teacher, or when the lesson didn't turn out the way I expected? Would she understand?* I also worried about how I could help her to feel comfortable in the classroom. Some of these anxieties were not verbalized at the time. I wasn't sure what it was I felt unsure about.

Teachers often feel uneasy about someone coming into our classrooms. We know the newcomer does not know the full context of our situation - the kids, the school climate, our extracurricular and supervision duties, parental support, all impact on the job we do in the classroom. I worried about the effect of another person in the classroom. *How would that affect my relationship with the kids, the way that I teach, and the behavior of the kids?* This mish mash of

---

[1] This story has since been published in *Among Teachers, 14,* Summer 1994.

questions tumbled around in my mind mixed with the excitement of having a colleague to share and exchange ideas with, and the opportunity to showcase some of the things that I thought I was doing right as a junior high teacher. I thought of myself as a grade 7 specialist, having taught that grade for some years. I was looking forward to the opportunity to discuss the reasons for doing some of the things I do and also to reflect on some things that I do somewhat intuitively.

I guess the first time I realized that Kathie was appreciative of some of the things I was doing in the classroom was when she had been there for a couple of weeks and a parent-visitor came to the class. Kathie later told me (orally and in a story she had written) that the parent had made derogatory comments to her about the lesson. The parent said our class on geometric shapes and three dimensional objects looked more like an art lesson than a math lesson. She thought it was of no academic value and a waste of time. Kathie explained to the parent some of the philosophy behind the lesson, how it connected with other lessons that we had been doing on measurement, the rationale for working in groups, and the importance of a creative design component. Kathie explained the logic involved in relating a two dimensional template to a three dimensional object. I was relieved when I heard this.

Kathie: I was extremely surprised by Janet's revelation a year later that the parent-visitor story had been a turning point in the research for her. I thought she had not given the story much credence. When I had written the parent-visitor story in early December 1992, it was only four weeks after I had started coming to her classroom. Though I knew I wanted to use a narrative approach to the research and had read widely on this, I was very unsure of how to *do* it. When Janet told me stories about her teaching it was relatively easy to record them by making notes about them. But I knew that her stories were not

the only stories and I was not sure how to pull together the many threads that were already appearing in the research. I did not feel confident that I could do this in a meaningful way. When I wrote the parent-visitor story it was an experiment - a first attempt - to pull together a number of incidents that I saw happening in her classroom and which I thought were relevant to the research, and I tried to tell these as a story.

In writing the story, I felt like it almost wrote itself. The story was about multiple perspectives of what was happening in a classroom - the teacher's, the parent's, the student teachers', the students' and mine. I realized that this was an important story for me because telling it caused me to ask questions about how research is done, about what counts as data, about the interpretation of data, and about the accepted norm of the researcher's perspective as the right one or the only one. In telling this story I also questioned my own role as researcher. I realized that the story exposed my initial dilemma about defending Janet's practice to the parent-visitor. In becoming involved in the research, I felt I had breached the requirement for objectivity in research. In telling this story I began to understand that it would be impossible to do this research and maintain an objective stance as the researcher.

Writing the story resulted in contradictions for me as researcher. It was rich. I knew I had told a story of the many things going on in Janet's classroom and had begun to raise important methodological issues. It concerned me, however, that I had constructed the story on my own. The research was supposed to be collaborative and the thought that I was writing, pulling together events and interpretations on my own, nagged at me. How could we do narrative research and be collaborative when Janet held a full-time job teaching? While I realized it was my responsibility to write, I was struggling with the question: *How does one do this and still allow the other person space to*

decide what is important and what it means? I didn't know and I hoped that I was on the right track with this my first attempt.

I took the story to Janet at school and waited eagerly for her to read it. I wanted her to say it was good. She read it but she did not make a comment. I was desperate to know what she thought, but tried not to show it. When I got a chance to talk to her at the end of the day I asked her what she thought about the story. She said, "Mmmm." So I asked her if it was how she saw things had been happening. She said, "It's close." I took her comment to mean that all I had was *my* story, and, though it was an interesting story, it was only "close" to, but not, *her* story. I thought I had failed and was very critical of myself. I decided that this was not the way to do collaborative narrative research and resolved not to try to pull events together into a story on my own any more. In future I would concentrate on compiling field notes and then talk with Janet about the meanings. Somehow we would construct the research stories together.

A year later at our November 1993 meeting when Janet told me that the parent-visitor story was a turning point in the research for her I shared with her my reaction to her comment "It's close." I told her I later realized after working in her classroom for about three months that I had been foolish. By then I had realized that no matter how hard I tried or how well I wrote that I would never be able to capture someone else's story. I recognized the unrealistic task I had set myself when I wrote the parent-visitor story and when I had waited for Janet to affirm it. (I was learning to relate my life, and my learning from life, to doing research. We tell many stories of an event in our lives, and in research too.) By this time I had also come to know Janet a lot better. I had come to know that "It's close" is high praise from Janet. She is critical of her reticence to give praise and she sees that she has modeled herself on her mother in this regard.

Frequently she has told me stories of her doing something very, very well as a child and how her mother would only say, "Mmmm."

We both laughed when we found out how the other felt and when we realized that we had kept our stories private for so long. It was a year before we shared with each other what the story and our responses to it had meant for each of us. Why did it take so long? We had a positive research relationship and had become friends, so why didn't we tell each other? Our stories emphasize the need to allow for time to develop trust in a research relationship.

Shared Responsibility in Collaborative Research

We took time to break free of the traditional division of labor that happens when one person is designated "researcher" and the other "participant." At first Kathie assumed responsibility for data collection: writing field notes, conducting interviews, collecting documentation. In her classroom Janet was busy with teaching so it was unrealistic for her to write in a research journal. She took the research journal home each week, or each month and, on occasion, the day Kathie's notes had been done. On her evenings and weekends she responded to Kathie's notes, wrote her observations in the journal, and indicated where she considered information was confidential. Janet retained the right of veto.

As the days spent together in Janet's classroom passed into months we became friends. In our talks after class, on weekends, in our many phone calls, and on the odd occasion that Janet got a lunch-break, we told each other about our lives and what is important to each of us. Our relationships (in our families and in our teaching) figured heavily in these talks. As we came to know each other better, we felt more comfortable about sharing our roles and responsibilities in the research. Janet often took on the researcher role reflecting on Kathie's stories and experiences, retelling those stories and

sharing her interpretations. Janet also collected research data about her students. Negotiating responsibility for teaching in Janet's classroom, however, caused us to confront very early in the study what we meant by collaboration.

Janet: At first, when Kathie was giving the kids instructions on tessellations (repeating graphical designs) in a math class, I had mixed feelings. On the one hand, I felt a bit defensive. I thought that she was filling in the gaps where she thought I had missed the boat. At the same time, I was glad that the kids were getting some added attention that's impossible for one teacher to provide in a class of 28 students. Kathie broke the sequence of design formation into nine squares, and showed how to complete a miniature version of the complete design, so that the kids could get the pattern and see the whole concept on a small scale. I thought that strategy was quite good and I decided to teach it that way next time. I learned from watching her and from noticing what the kids were doing, that I probably should do more demonstrations and practice next time. Most kids did not understand the concept of a sliding tessellation. One thing bothered me somewhat. It seemed that she was telling them too much and not allowing them discover the patterns for themselves. At the time I didn't say anything to Kathie. I wasn't able to verbalize what bothered me about it. I thought Kathie was the expert because she was doing the Ph.D. Thinking about it now, if Kathie had not been there, and if it had not been so early in the partnership we were developing, I would have stopped the whole class and given a mini-lesson on the sliding part. It was clear the kids didn't get it. But I had made a commitment to the exercise and because I didn't know what Kathie would think if I just stopped in the middle, I continued on as if that was the way I had planned it. It was the first time I had taught the unit, and I have quite a few modifications for next time based on our classroom observations and experiences. I take a lot of risks with

my teaching. I have brilliant lessons, and I have duds. Sometimes what works well with one class doesn't work with another. I felt it was important for Kathie to know this, but I wasn't sure at the time if she did.

Kathie: In the math tessellations lesson I attempted to help students when I observed that a large number of kids were just not "getting it." At first I wasn't sure what to do to help them as I had never heard of a tessellation before and did not know how to construct one. The next time I was in the class I experienced the same difficulty of trying to help a lot of kids get started on something that most of them did not seem to understand how to do, and I still had not "got it." There was a concept of the sliding tessellation to be understood and I had tried to "pick it up" from Janet's demonstration. For the kids, getting started seemed the main problem. I watched Janet give a demonstration on the blackboard as well as individual demonstrations with small groups of students. Suddenly the process of tessellations made sense to me and I felt able to "be a teacher" in the classroom. I began showing groups of students in twos and threes, how to do a tessellation in a six step process. (I adapted Janet's methodology and developed a new one of my own which made sense to me.) For the kids who had trouble thinking up a pattern to start off the tessellation I drew a template to get them started.

Reflecting on this lesson and Janet's story of this lesson I realize that a number of factors came into play for me: I saw that kids were not "getting it" (the concepts involved in doing a tessellation); time was passing; the material had to be covered; I thought that there needed to be a result to prove learning had occurred. I believed the result was important. In terms of the conduit metaphor for teaching and learning (Clandinin & Connelly, 1992), I achieved what I now recognize as a problematic view of teaching. Further, I did not know how to "be" in another teacher's classroom for the purpose of doing research. In my

previous school I had regularly been in other teachers' classrooms, but I always carried with me the authority of my roles as a teacher and department head in that school. In Janet's classroom, however, I was just another adult in the room. I had none of the authority that goes with being known as a teacher in that school. I had no legal responsibility to teach, to discipline students, to assign homework or to make any of (what I thought then were) the important decisions concerning the classroom.

Though I was competent at math, I had never taught math as a course. It had seemed quite realistic when negotiating this research with Janet to assume that I could be a researcher in her classroom, take notes about what was happening and also be a co-teacher. I was busy keeping up with my commitments on campus, including teaching, and did not have the time to also plan with Janet the content or teaching strategies for her seven classes. I did not imagine that this would be a problem as teaching was mostly her responsibility. However, when I tried to be a co-teacher, which we thought was a good way for me to be integrated into her classroom, it immediately became evident that I needed to know the content that she was attempting to teach and I also needed to develop strategies for teaching that content which made sense to me. Very quickly, I also realized that I needed to get to *know* her students. There was much to know about each of them that Janet was aware of and I was not at this early stage in the research - knowledge that made a difference as to whether the students learned or not. The curriculum that I saw being lived out (Eisner, 1988; Clandinin & Connelly, 1992) in her classroom drew heavily on her relationships with the students and her knowledge of each student as a person. Even though I knew myself to be an intelligent and experienced teacher, I found I could only be a teacher in limited ways in her classroom when

I focused on teaching as knowing the content. I needed to know her students if I really wanted to participate in the curriculum they were living out.

We resolved the dilemmas raised in these stories through writing to each other in the research journal about our feelings of discomfort and through talking to each other about how at risk each of us felt. We found it reassuring to learn that we both felt vulnerable in the research. We began to trust each other more and to expand our conceptions and practices of shared responsibility in the research. Towards the end of the school year we presented together at a national conference, describing our methodology and early findings.

Kathie: There were risks for both us in this venture. As a classroom teacher addressing a conference of university researchers, Janet knew she was telling a new story of educational research. There were few teachers from schools there. Going public as co-researchers in this study felt risky for me as a doctoral candidate. The university expected me to be responsible for "my study." But Janet and I were sharing the responsibility and some of the work in the study, in "our study," and we wanted to talk with other researchers about how this was changing the research. Being willing to take some risks, while at all times caring for the other, has developed our commitment to each other as professionals and as friends.

When I ended fieldwork in Janet's classroom in late June 1993 we were unsure how the ensuing writing process would enable both of our voices to emerge. In the fall we re-negotiated our responsibilities in the study. Though we maintained our initial agreement that Janet's major responsibility was her teaching with research secondary, we began to change our original plans concerning writing the research reports. Janet began to be a co-author of the research papers.

Janet: *Why did I accept more responsibility in this study? Why did I start to write?* It is important to think about why I, as a teacher, would involve myself in writing about our collaborative study. Throughout the study Kathie continued to ask me if I was comfortable with my role in the research. She asked how I felt about each aspect. I was flattered to be asked to speak at an educational conference because hardly anybody cares what a teacher thinks. She gave me the message over and over again that what I had to say was important. I started to believe that I had something important to say.

Knowledge Construction in Collaborative Research

In a January 1994 doctoral research committee meeting, Kathie was asked how she planned to link the stories on "shared responsibility" that Janet and she had written to "teacher knowledge" (the thesis focus). Good question, but she did not know the answer. She did know that shared responsibility was important to this research. Janet had shown her that. The most she could say was that Janet used responsibility as an interpretive frame for her teaching. Kathie had borrowed this term from Cochrane-Smyth and Lytle (1993). It sounded good - but what did she mean? What was it that she was trying to say? One of her advisors pushed her a little further and asked, "How are you going to get out of the stories? How are you going to make connections to knowledge?" Kathie answered as honestly as she could. She said that she didn't know yet. Part of her felt confident that she and Janet were on their way to answering this difficult question, but another part of her felt little pangs of worry - worry that they might not find an answer.

Kathie turned her adviser's questions over and over in her mind, trying to find a clue. A question had been framed that was integral to the study and she could not think clearly about a possible answer until she understood why the

question felt so important to her. She was involved in the stories and found it hard to get past them. The research stories were rich, full of numerous threads and they told her so much. Though she had earlier viewed some of the stories as able to speak for themselves, she started thinking about the meanings of the stories and of retelling as a way of accessing the multiple meanings of the stories. Her advisor's question helped her to think further. The research texts needed to say *why* the stories are important.

Kathie: In a weekend meeting with Janet to work on a paper we were writing on responsibility and relationships as themes in the research data, I shared the questions raised in my doctoral committee meeting. In response, Janet did what I had done, and returned to the stories. At first we focused on her strategies for sharing decision making in her classroom and the ways she gave her students choices. But this only answered "how" and not "why" Janet shared responsibility for learning in her classroom. I said, "In your classroom you shared responsibility with your students because you wanted them to see themselves as constructors of knowledge. Our stories about you allowing students to make decisions and have choices in their learning describe the strategies you used in your practice to live out your philosophy." Janet agreed. We could both see that shared responsibility was important to her teaching, and to teaching and learning broadly conceived. But we could not explain *why*.

We sat there in her kitchen struggling with this - struggling with what we knew and trying to name it. I continued to think out loud saying, "We know shared responsibility for learning is important, because it works. It seems like common sense and yet if it is, then why doesn't everyone know it? This is like a jigsaw and we have a piece missing." Janet started to draw a conceptual map made of jigsaw shapes. She drew two separate shapes and listed responsibility and teacher knowledge inside each one. Then she connected

them with another shape labeled "effective teaching and learning." She also drew a fourth puzzle shape linked to teacher knowledge and labeled it "research." Beside the effective teaching and learning shape she wrote, "If I choose I learn it better." She was trying to answer the question, "Why is shared responsibility important?" I responded verbally to her notes, "Yes, but what does that tell us about teacher knowledge?" She drew a box beside teacher knowledge and wrote "interactive knowing." Then she started talking about her own learning and how she constructs knowledge. She said, "If I can base my future knowledge on my past knowledge, it's like a step from one to the other. It's a link."

I knew she was moving our thinking in a positive direction and that we were helping each other to answer an important question in the research. Her explanation of past and future knowledge, of building upon knowledge one already has, helped my thinking on this issue. I remembered the work of Belenky and her colleagues (1986), particularly their concepts of received knowledge and constructed knowledge. A received knower is someone who sees that she can learn from others but who views all knowledge as constructed outside of herself. A received knower does not perceive that she can construct knowledge. Though the research of Belenky and her colleagues was with women, their findings have relevance for learners in general. Their epistemological basis interested us. Janet and I began to interpret the implications of these findings in terms of teaching and learning. We saw that the concepts of received and constructed knowing opened up possibilities for thinking about how knowledge is constructed in classrooms and in research. We recognized we were constructing knowledge together.

We started to talk about how shared responsibility for learning fits with a conception of constructed knowledge and drew on the stories we had shared

and written that described how shared responsibility was lived out in Janet's teaching. We realized shared responsibility for learning was a central theme in our research on teacher knowledge. We began to talk about the importance of assuming responsibility for constructing your own knowledge, for students, and for teachers. We began to see that in sharing responsibility in this inquiry into teaching we were taking responsibility for our own development.

Why Are We Telling These Stories?

These stories demonstrate how our research relationship and how our sharing of responsibility in a collaborative narrative study of teaching influence construction of the research knowledge. We tell our stories in order to draw attention to methodological and epistemological issues inherent in this type of research.

In telling our initial responses to the parent-visitor story we show how our research relationship formed over time and how the research changed when trust developed between us. It took time for Janet to feel comfortable that her meanings and emphases of teaching would be respected and included. It took time for Kathie to be able to critique a conception of truth that conflicted with her experiences in the study. It took time for both of us to reach a point in our relationship where we felt safe enough to question out loud each other's ideas, values, and developing (as well as entrenched) philosophies. Once we were able to trust each other, we shared insights and gave each other information that we were not prepared to share without the trust. Our stories demonstrate the importance of the research relationship to collaborative research on teacher development. Knowing the person is crucial.

A central issue in our stories concerns the need for both the teacher and the researcher to know the context for teaching (and research) and how this

knowledge fits with developing a research relationship. When Kathie wrote the parent-visitor story she emphasized the need for a visitor to Janet's classroom to be aware of the continuity the teacher was striving for - how and why an individual lesson commonly fits in a sequence of lessons. Janet's emphasis on continuity in her teaching and the time it takes her students to learn influenced Kathie's writing of the story. Seeing her meanings of the importance of knowing the context of the classroom and the context in which a lesson is set referred to in the story helped Janet trust Kathie as a co-researcher and trust the research process. Janet's realization that the research would support her development as a teacher rather than judge her as a "good" or "bad" teacher increased her commitment to the inquiry.

For us, articulating the importance of knowing the context for Janet's teaching, and knowing the context in which our study is set, led us into numerous discussions about subjectivity and objectivity in educational research. When Janet began the research she exclaimed: "There's no such thing as objective research!" Kathie's background in science and the overwhelming messages of the need for "reliable data" in graduate research methods courses, caused her initially to worry about subjectivity as a researcher. Even so, at the beginning of the study she had many questions about truth and the assumptions about what constitutes "good research." Despite Kathie's early recognition that the parent-visitor story revealed multiple perspectives of what was happening in Janet's classroom, at the time of writing the story she still had not completely let go of the notion of a single truth. Later she saw the contradiction inherent in writing a story about multiple perspectives of what was happening in a classroom and wanting Janet to say it was exactly as things had happened. The transition in her thinking about knowledge and truth is part of her story and signifies her ongoing development as a

consequence of inquiry into practice. Both our stories speak to the transition in our thinking: how we were learning to be collaborative; how we were learning to research our meanings of the relationship between theory and practice; and, how we were learning about ourselves. We show that collaborative teacher research can be transformative research.

Our intent in telling the "tesselations stories" is to show that collaboration is not easy or simple. The tessellations lesson provides an example from early in the study where we began to problematize our roles and responsibilities. When we told each other of the dilemmas we experienced in this lesson we began to question our prior assumptions about what it means to be collaborative in a study of teaching. Our different experiences in this lesson also caused us to confront our conceptions of curriculum. Kathie's initial attempts to "deliver" curriculum were challenged by her realization that in Janet's classroom curriculum was a dynamic enacted and lived out with students. She learned that she needed to develop relationships with Janet's students for knowledge construction to occur. Through reflective conversations and writing with Janet, Kathie saw her practices in this lesson as problematic; her teaching as "delivery" of information. She felt in conflict with the constructivist teaching she espoused and believed she had practiced in her teaching of Textiles and Design. Reading Clandinin and Connelly's (1992) criticism of the influence of a "conduit metaphor" in curriculum reform, wherein ideas are reduced to objects and teachers' work is minimalized to delivery of ideas along the conduit, helped her articulate her conflict. Both co-researchers moved to new levels of understanding of curriculum as a consequence of discussion and reflection on their different experiences of shared responsibility for teaching.

In Janet's classroom, and later in our writing together, we were exposed to each other's weaknesses and strengths. We learned that each of us had to give and to assert if this collaborative relationship was going to work. The ways in which we have shared responsibility have required two-way trust and, in turn, the trust has developed our research relationship. We continued to re-negotiate our responsibilities to meet our requirement that this work be useful to each of us. Our view supports Cole and Knowles' argument that collaboration requires not "*equal* involvement in all aspects of the research; but rather for *negotiated and mutually agreed upon* involvement" (1993, p.486). We did not share responsibility in ways that were equal. Janet was always responsible for her students in legal and professional ways that Kathie was not. It is Kathie's responsibility to prepare a dissertation that will meet the university's requirements for award of a doctorate.

Shared responsibility is a central issue in collaborative research, demanding a shared vulnerability. In our view, the importance of shared vulnerability in collaborative research is not widely understood. Persons who have not engaged in collaborative studies with teachers may find it difficult to understand how shared experience of risk significantly alters the research. LaRocque (1995) reminds us that collaborative research between teachers in schools and persons located at the university, must involve risk-taking and vulnerability by <u>both</u> parties. This is a profound change from an old story of research done ON teachers. In being "observed" in educational research (but not included in interpretation of their practices), teachers have commonly been positioned in ways that placed them "at risk." Researchers in not addressing their own stories or practices in studies of teaching, have avoided the vulnerable positions in which participating teachers have often been placed. Our "tesselations" stories describe how shared responsibility in our

collaborative study has involved each co-researcher taking risk and feeling vulnerable.

Our stories describe how we were figuring out how "to be" and how to share responsibility and authority in the research. At first, as Janet tried to be the expert teacher who never made a mistake or changed her mind about a lesson plan, and as Kathie tried to be the expert researcher and co-teacher who could step into Janet's class and simply "be a teacher," we tried to mask our vulnerability, not even admitting it to ourselves. In our research conversations and in the research journal we shared with each other how "at risk" we felt. We began to see that shared vulnerability was necessary to collaboration and was strengthening our relationship. We were able to see ourselves as collaborative researchers. Acknowledging our differing vulnerabilities allowed us to talk about and discard our earlier expectations. The pressure we felt to be experts was contradictory to our reality of "figuring out" how to be collaborative. We thought about where this pressure had come from and why.

Britzman's (1986, 1991) critique of the cultural myth of the "teacher as expert" in teacher education is relevant to our dilemmas with the notion of "expert" in this study. Britzman's criticism has an epistemological basis. In her view, the myth that the teacher has to know the answers, reduces knowledge to a set of discrete and isolated units to be acquired and "not knowing" is perceived as a threat to the teacher's authority. She argues that the myth of the teacher as expert serves to deny the problems of how teacher education students come to know, how they learn and how they teach. We suggest that the negative effects and pervasiveness of the myth of the expert for other aspects of education remain to be made public. The myth of the expert is active in educational research in a number of subtle and not so subtle ways and as Britzman points out, how we think about knowledge is part of the problem.

Our purpose in telling the story of data analysis in Janet's kitchen is to show the mutual and social process of knowledge construction and reconstruction in our collaborative study - a process which involves both of us co-researchers. Our story of questioning why shared responsibility in Janet's classroom is important provides an example of how we have worked collaboratively in determining *what* is important and *why*, in this research. This story of how we work together to construct the research knowledge challenges conceptions of the researcher as the determiner of research findings, and the researcher as "the expert." Such a conception structures a research relationship as hierarchical and thus impedes collaboration. When models of research on teaching assume that the researcher decides what constitutes data, decides the meanings of that data, and informs teachers of the meanings, then teachers are placed in the position of received knowers and the researcher is positioned as the expert. We describe how we negotiated a collaborative narrative methodology which allowed us to challenge the notion of the researcher as "the expert." We learned in the process that the research methodology and findings are altered when trust develops in the researcher-participant relationship, and, by a process in which both persons share responsibility for the research design, decisions about what constitutes data and the meanings of that data - that is, when responsibility for construction of the research knowledge is shared. In an article that also explores issues of relationship and shared responsibility in collaborative teacher development research, Cole and Knowles (1993) argue that epistemological and methodological changes are demanded when teachers are included as co-researchers in all phases of research.

When we both assumed roles of teacher and researcher, we were able to go beyond the expert-received knower model and gain insights not otherwise

available to us. The implications of our story concern recognition of teachers as knowledge constructors in educational research. In acknowledging data collection and data analysis in our study as mutually constructed knowledge, we are changing not only HOW research is done, but what has been traditionally defined as research. Our intent is to advocate that educational research should be developmental for BOTH teacher and researcher. In this regard we are attempting to redefine the purposes of teacher research and to argue for recognition by school systems and universities of the development possibilities for teachers and researchers engaged in collaborative research.

The stories shared in this paper also demonstrate that our teacher research is not located solely within the confines of Janet's classroom. Our collaborative study is set within a broader educational and research context in which there are powerful meta-narratives at work. One such powerful story assumes that the university researcher should decide the research questions and focus, as well as be the person responsible for (have the authority in) educational research. There are other stories that are similarly contradictory if we begin to deconstruct their meanings in terms of teacher development. The conduit metaphor critiqued by Clandinin and Connelly (1992) in relation to curriculum reform, also has relevance for much of the research that has been done ON teachers and teaching. Teachers have been treated as the eventual receivers of the knowledge of university researchers (Cochrane-Smith & Lytle, 1993). We are critical of claims to knowledge about teaching by research that does not include the voices and meanings of teachers.

Implications for Teacher Research and Epistemology

In educational research the researcher has traditionally been considered "the expert," deciding research focus, findings and meanings of data. This view

derives from an objective view of knowledge (Code, 1991) and assumptions that are problematic for a study of teacher knowledge. Those assumptions are that knowledge is fixed; acontextual; transferred from the "one knowing" to the one "not-knowing." In our research we have been concerned with expanding what counts as knowledge. We negotiated a methodology that allowed us to challenge the assumptions underpinning the objective view of knowledge. Our teacher and researcher stories of practice reveal that the ways we use and construct knowledge in the research are: dynamic and not fixed, highly contextual and interactive (rather than a one-way transfer of knowledge from one person to the other), and relational, that is, dependent on the knowing that comes from being "in-relationship" (Hollingsworth et al, 1993, 1994). We are beginning to describe our personal practical knowledge (Elbaz, 1983; Connelly & Clandinin, 1985; Clandinin, 1986; Connelly & Clandinin, 1988) as teachers. Research on teachers' personal practical knowledge describes the ways teachers construct and reconstruct their knowledge - how teachers' practices are expressions of their knowledge. The knowledge being constructed in our work together is influenced by our research relationship and our sharing of responsibility in and for the study.

Conclusion

Our engagement in collaborative narrative research about teacher knowledge and curriculum has helped us challenge assumptions about knowledge construction within classrooms *and* within university-school research. We see parallels between teaching and learning in a classroom and research on teachers' knowledge. The same themes of shared responsibility and relationship that influence a teacher's knowledge construction with students (Webb & Blond, In Press) also influence knowledge construction in

collaborative research about teaching. In the same way that our knowledge in this research has developed step-by-step, so too our relationship has moved forward. As we began to share responsibility in the study we came to trust each other more and found that the research relationship was being reinforced by sharing responsibility and knowledge.

In doing this research we moved into uncharted territory and adopted an openness to "working it out." We knew from our experiences of teaching that we might make some mistakes, but these could be part of our learning. Our stories show that we influence each other's thinking and our knowing is influenced by the contexts in which we work and live: Knowing each other, knowing the students, knowing the school, influences the knowledge we construct together. Flexibility in the ways we shared responsibility enabled us to access information that would not otherwise have been revealed. The research methodology, findings and interpretations of data, hinge on our research relationship.

A further rationale for describing our methodology and what we have learned as co-researchers in a collaborative narrative study, concerns making a case for the multiple perspectives of persons engaged in educational research. Our work challenges an objective view of knowledge based on the notion of a single truth concerning research findings and researcher objectivity (as in an uninvolved impersonal stance) as the criteria for "good" research. The promotion of objectivity in research is based on the idea that a single truth exists and can be determined. Such a stance limits the findings of research in teacher development. We do not claim to have presented a "complete picture" in our research findings, but by working as co-researchers, we help others understand there is more than one perspective of what happens in a classroom or in a research project. We asked questions of one another and came to new

questions together. If we had only asked Kathie's questions it would have been a very different piece of research.

Our experience is that when the researcher and practitioner share their personal stories and meanings of the data, in being "in relationship" with each other and in drawing knowledge from that relationship, then not only is the research methodology changed, but different findings are yielded than if only the researcher interprets the data. We suggest collaborative narrative research, by and with teachers, offers the opportunity for a richer, more detailed and more meaningful research base for teacher knowledge - one which will "ring true" to the experiences of teachers.

Finally, we stress the need to think about how teachers learn, and question whether the role for teachers in research on teaching acknowledges teachers as constructors of knowledge or implies that teachers will be the receivers and eventual implementers of university researchers' findings. Our research stories provide support for reconceptualized views of knowledge and research, and, demonstrate that collaborative teacher research has the potential to transform how we think about teacher development.

Bibliography

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B., Goldberger., N., and Tarule, J. (1986). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice and mind.* NY: Basic Books.

Britzman, D. (1986). Cultural myths in the making of a teacher: Biography and social structure in teacher education. *Harvard Educational Review, 56* (4), 442-454.

Britzman, D. (1991). *Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach.* NY: SUNY.

Bruner, J. (1990). *Acts of meaning.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Carter, K. (1993). The place of story in the study of teaching and teacher education. *Educational Researcher,* 22 (1), 5-12.

Clandinin, D. J. (1986). *Classroom practice: Teacher images in action.* PA: Falmer Press.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1992). Teacher as curriculum maker. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum,* American Educational Research Association, NY: MacMillan, 363-401.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1990). Research on teaching and teacher research: The issues that divide. *Educational Researcher, 19* (2), 2-11.

Cochran-Smith, M., & Lytle, S. (1993). *Inside outside: Teacher research and knowledge.* NY: Teachers College Press.

Code, L. (1991). *What can she know?: Feminist theory and the construction of knowledge.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Cole, A. L., & Knowles, J. G. (1993). Teacher development partnership research: A focus on methods and issues. *American Educational Research Journal 30* (3), 473-495.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1985). Personal practical knowledge and the modes of knowing: Relevance for teaching and learning. In E. Eisner (Ed.), *Learning and teaching the ways of knowing.* IL: University of Chicago Press. 174-198.

Connelly F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1988). *Teachers as curriculum planners: Narratives of experience.* NY: Teachers College Press.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher, 19* (5), 2-14.

Eisner, E. W. (1988). The primacy of experience and the politics of method. *Educational Researcher* (June/July)15-20.

Elbaz, F. (1983). *Teacher thinking: A study of practical knowledge.* NY: Nichols.

Florio-Ruane, S. (1991). Conversation and narrative in collaborative research. In C. Witherell, & N. Noddings (Eds.), *Stories lives tell: Narrative and dialogue in education.* NY: Teachers College Press. 234-256.

Hollingsworth S., Dybdahl, M., & Minarik, L. T. (1993). By chart and chance and passion: The importance of relational knowing in learning to teach. *Curriculum Inquiry 23(1),* 5-35.

Hollingsworth, S., Cody, A., Davis-Smallwood, J., Dybdahl, M., Gallagher, P., Gallego, M., Maestre, T., Minarik, L. T., Raffel, L., Standerford, N. S., & Teel, K. M. (1994). *Teacher research and urban literacy education: Lessons and conversations in a feminist key.* NY: Teachers College Press.

LaRocque, L. (1995). Some thoughts on school-university collaboration. *Canadian Administrator, 34* (5), 1-10.

Polkinghorne, D. (1988). *Narrative knowing in the human sciences.* NY: SUNY Press.

Rorty, R. (1991). *Objectivity, relativism and truth: Philosophical papers volume 1.* Cambridge MA: Cambridge University Press.

Webb, (1994). The parent-visitor story. *Among Teachers.* J.C.T.D. OISE & C.R.T.E.D University of Alberta: Among Teachers Community, 14, 5-9.

Webb, K. M. & Blond J. M. (In Press). Teacher knowledge: The relationship between caring and knowing. *Teaching and Teacher Education.*

Wittrock, M. C. (1986). *Handbook of research on teaching. (3rd ed.)* . NY: MacMillan.

CHAPTER 3

TEACHER KNOWLEDGE: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CARING AND KNOWING *

Kathie Webb & Janet Blond

> It's a curious alchemy, the way caring enters into and transmutes other activities.
> Mary Catherine Bateson, *Composing a Life.* (1990, p.157)

> To care for someone, I must *know* many things. I must know, for example, who the other is, what his powers and limitations are, what his needs are, and what is conducive to his growth: I must know how to respond to his needs, and what my own powers and limitations are. Milton Mayeroff, *On Caring.* (1971, p.9)

Introduction

Though Noddings' highly regarded work draws attention to the importance of caring in education and while students and parents commonly acknowledge the importance of the "caring teacher," little acknowledgment of caring as an issue exists at the level of educational policymaking. "Caring" in education tends to be dismissed as a "warm fuzzy." Too difficult to analyze or categorize, impossible to put a number on, caring is disregarded. This paper presents teacher and researcher stories which describe a teacher's practice and her knowledge from caring and being *in-relationship* with her students - her *relational knowing* (Hollingsworth et al, 1993, 1994): a kind of knowing that alters her pedagogy and the curriculum constructed and enacted with each student. Caring for the person (Noddings, 1984, 1986, 1992) is revealed as central to the teacher's knowing. Our argument concerns recognition of an epistemological role for caring in teacher knowledge, and hence the policies

---

*This paper is In Press with *Teaching and Teacher Education.* An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Canadian Society for the Study of Education XXII Annual Conference, Calgary June 15-18, 1994.

directed toward teacher development. Our intent is to make explicit what Bateson (1990) has referred to as a curious alchemy - the way caring enters into and transmutes Janet's teacher knowledge and how this becomes lived out in her practice and the activities in her classroom.

Claiming an Epistemological Role for Caring

The problem in suggesting that caring influences knowing, and in naming that knowledge as *relational knowing* is more than one of trying to describe or value something esoteric. The central issue has to do with what counts as knowledge. Historically, knowing people has not been counted as knowledge. Code (1991) critiques the structure for knowledge, and reveals objective knowledge (distant from and not influenced by the knower) has high status as knowledge, whereas *knowing people* historically has been considered subjective (influenced by the knower), and has not been regarded as knowledge. She states: "Knowledge, as the tradition defines it is *of* objects. Only when people can be assimilated to objects is it possible to know them" (p.39). Code challenges this long standing assumption by claiming that knowing other people is a worthy contender for knowledge and stresses, "The process of knowing other people requires constant learning: How to be with them, respond to them, act toward them" (p.39).

The rationale for sharing our teacher and researcher narratives is to claim that Janet cares and that her caring influences how she teaches her students. Janet cares about the subject matter she teaches - this is evident in her preparation to teach, her extensive collection of teaching materials, the way she decorates her room, the numerous professional development courses she attends and her enthusiasm in the classroom. But Janet also cares about, and for, her students. She cares not only that they learn what she teaches, but that

they want to learn and that they feel they have choices in their learning environment. In this paper she shares stories of students who she sees have been forced to learn or conform by teachers, parents and school policies, and who have resisted. In telling her stories, she shares her knowledge from more than 1800 days of being in classrooms with junior high school students and from trying to teach all of her students. She shares her *knowledge of* persons and how this knowledge influences her pedagogy. Her caring for students motivates her to gather information about each student that will help her to know the person who is the student, in order to know how to teach them. In congruence with Mayeroff and Code's words, Janet articulates in this paper what *she knows* about how to *be with,* how to *respond to,* and how to *act towards* her students.

A more complex and more challenging understanding of the relationship between caring and knowing as these relate to Janet's teacher knowledge, however, is presented in this paper. Extending Johnson's (1989) interpretation of Dewey's conception of knowledge, "It was John Dewey I believe, who saw most clearly that knowledge is not some fixed and static thing, but rather an activity (of knowing) by means of which we are able to transform our experience," our view of teacher knowledge is similarly one that emphasizes "activity, construction, interaction, and ongoing adjustment of the organism to the environment" (p.363). We suggest that Janet's teacher stories also reveal her *knowledge with* students - the ways her knowing and caring *interact with* her students' knowing in the process of teaching and learning in a given context.

Theoretical Frame

The argument for epistemological recognition of caring in teaching presented in this paper draws from and brings together three fields of research and theorizing: epistemology, teacher knowledge, and caring. Our research is situated among the work of theorists and researchers who contest the objectified, "scientific," or "modern" structure for knowledge and who have put forward alternative constructs/concepts for knowledge: constructions which recognize knowledge as at once objective AND subjective, as socially constructed (Vygotsky, 1978), personal (Polanyi, 1958) and grounded in one's experiences (Scheffler, 1977; Johnson, 1987, 1989; Code, 1991). With reference to education and teaching, our research is specifically located within the field of *teacher knowledge* and aligned with that of researchers attempting to expand and further explain *teachers' personal practical knowledge* (Elbaz, 1983; Clandinin, 1986; Connelly & Clandinin, 1985, 1988). Dewey's (1938) call for an education based on a philosophy of experience informs this work as well as alternative epistemological theories put forward to help portray the ways teachers use and hold their practical knowledge; *narrative knowing* (Polkinghorne, 1988; Coles, 1989; Connelly & Clandinin, 1990), *relational knowing* (Hollingsworth et al, 1993, 1994) and *embodied knowing* (Johnson, 1987, 1989). With these researchers and theorists, we view teacher knowledge as historical, autobiographical, storied, embodied, relational and situated within the continually changing context of teachers' professional and personal lives.

Elbaz's (1983) research with one teacher (Sarah) provided a framework for thinking about teacher knowledge. She identified five content areas of teacher knowledge reflective of Schwab's commonplaces (self, milieu, subject matter, curriculum development, and institutional knowledge). Elbaz also described five orientations of teacher knowledge (situational, personal, social,

experiential, theoretical) and three levels of structure that interrelate and support each other (rules of practice, practical principles and images). Her research, based on interviews and observations, showed how Sarah used her teacher knowledge to create personal meaning and to express her values - how she used her knowledge to shape a social context in which she could work comfortably. The framework Elbaz created has provided a starting point for teachers and researchers such as ourselves who are concerned with trying to portray how teachers' knowledge is lived out in practice and the ways it shapes classroom life. We find Elbaz's accounts and interpretations of the images Sarah used in extending her practical knowledge of teaching useful in trying to explain our interpretations of the ways caring plays a part in Janet's teacher knowledge. Sarah's images of "ally" (helping students to beat the system) and "good energetic teacher" (who takes responsibility for student learning) and her struggle with sometimes "giving too much and challenging too little" are revealing of her relationships with students. We see Sarah's images as also revealing of how her caring influences her teaching. Though Elbaz said that images served to order all aspects of Sarah's practical knowledge, her theory of teacher knowledge does not make the connection between knowing and caring that we do.

Hollingsworth et al (1993, 1994) and Lyons (1990) are amongst the first in educational research to make knowledge claims about what a teacher knows from being in-relation with students. Hollingsworth et al acknowledge teaching children is a personal and emotional process. These teacher-researchers tell stories of teachers' reliance on intuitive modes and argue for recognition of personal and relational development as a primary way of knowing about teaching which they call *relational knowing*. They describe relational knowing as "Attentionally generated through a sense of care for self and other," and that

it "occurs as much in energy or intuitive perception as in concrete or languaged form" (1993, p.10). Their findings and analyses mirror earlier research which focuses on nurses' practical knowledge (Benner, 1984); specifically nurses' knowledge from caring. Benner collected powerful data in the form of nurses' detailed reports and presented a strong case for validating caring as critical to the skills and knowledge of an expert nurse. Her 1984 book, and later research with Tanner (1987) and Wrubel (1989), demonstrated an epistemological basis for understanding caring in nursing, defined as *embodied knowledge* - a way of knowing with the mind and body. The work of these researchers highlighted the competencies and complex nature of the expert nurse's knowledge and has implications for understanding the complex relationship between caring and teacher knowledge.

Johnson's (1987, 1989) theorizing on the embodied nature of teachers' knowledge does not link caring with knowing. With Clandinin (1986) he suggests teachers experience the cycles of a typical school day rhythmically, through and with their bodies. Johnson's focus on teachers' knowing as embodied knowledge argues for new models of cognition which acknowledge the ways the human body interacts with the environment and specifically concerns the relationship between a teacher's knowing and the environment which informs and transforms his/her experience. He includes embodied knowledge as a dimension of teachers' narrative understandings: the stories teachers tell that are revealing of the ways they make sense of the world. Our focus on a teacher's knowledge, and our claims that her knowing is relational, acknowledges the complex nature of teacher knowledge and the interaction of multiple ways of knowing including relational, narrative and embodied knowing.

The word *caring* has many meanings and our attention to caring and teacher knowledge draws from diverse literature bases which recognize caring

as an act of communication between persons: caring in education (Noddings, 1984, 1992), including the importance of freedom of mind (Dewey, 1937, 1938; Greene, 1988); caring in nursing (Benner, 1894; Benner & Tanner, 1987; Benner & Wrubel, 1989; Watson, 1985, 1988; Montgomery, 1993); and earlier philosophizing on human relationships (Buber, 1957; Bateson, 1958; Mayeroff, 1971). Noddings has been singularly influential in gaining recognition for the importance of caring in education. Her emphasis that pedagogical caring is in the relation informs our research. But Noddings' arguments are not framed in epistemological terms. With Noddings we draw attention to the significance of the relationship between teacher and student, reciprocity and the two-way nature of caring, and take this a step further making knowledge claims for a teacher's caring. We acknowledge Mayeroff's (1971) treatise on caring which describes knowing as a major ingredient of caring and argues that to care for someone requires *knowledge of* that person. Though we agree with Mayeroff's argument and provide research data to support our claim that caring in teacher knowledge requires *knowledge of* students, our epistemological claim for caring in teacher knowledge is more complex and requires extending theories of the social construction of knowledge to include understanding caring as *knowledge with* - the interaction of knowing of two or more persons when in-relation. Our purpose in this paper is to further extend the understanding of teacher knowledge given by Elbaz and later built upon by Clandinin, Connelly and Clandinin, Johnson, Hollingsworth, Lyons and others. Our claim, is that caring is part of knowing in a teacher's knowledge: The knowing is *in the relation.* [1]

What we are saying, with Lyons (1990) and with Hollingsworth and her co-researchers (1993, 1994), is that teacher knowledge is relational: *knowing in-relation*. What we mean by *relational knowing* is the interaction of the

---

[1] We are indebted to Dr. D. Jean Clandinin for this insight into our work.

knowledge of two persons that happens when they are in-relation. In this instance, the two persons are teacher and student. Our view of teacher knowledge fits Lyons' (1990) concept of *nested knowing*. Lyons refers to the interdependence of teachers and students in learning as each group having an epistemology nested within the other's. She states: "Like a set of dynamic objects that are interacting with one another, although each is distinct in its own right, students and teachers come together in a special relationship in learning, having a clear epistemological basis" (1990, p.173). In talking about knowing and caring it is the *interaction of two sets of knowing*, the teacher's and the student's, we are concerned with.

Methodology

This paper is written by two teachers one of whom (Janet) continues to teach language arts, math and computers in junior high school classrooms in Alberta, Canada. The other (Kathie) left her Textiles and Design classroom in New South Wales, Australia in mid-1990 to pursue research which would enable her to ask questions about the kind of educational reforms she was experiencing as a grade 7-12 teacher and required to implement as a school department head. We met in February 1992 when Kathie commenced supervising teacher education students undertaking their final practicum at a school where Janet was teaching. Following approval of an application for ethics review with her university, Kathie took advantage of this opportunity for contact with teachers to commence her doctoral research on "teacher knowledge" and conducted pilot interviews with five teachers she met during the eight weeks at Janet's school. Later in March 1993, she wrote in her proposal for doctoral research:

> I asked these teachers to tell me about their practice, about how they learned and what they knew. An analysis of the pilot study data revealed these teachers were interested in and capable of talking about their practice . . . [and] voluntarily told stories about their practice. The stories revealed insights into the ways the teachers constructed their knowledge,. . . . a multiplicity of ways in which the teachers had been learning about their students and the ways they had been manipulating and redesigning the curriculum to fit the needs of their students. I asked three of the teachers if they would be interested in participating in a collaborative study of their personal practical knowledge as teachers. All of the teachers said, "Yes." Two of the teachers said they were not prepared to take on any extra work by way of journal writing or responding to my field notes. One of the teachers, "Janet," was quite excited by the idea of having a researcher in her classroom over a period of 6 months or more and of collaborating with that researcher about the research design, findings and meanings of the data.

In September 1992, Janet transferred to another junior high school which was closer to where she lived. We talked about starting the research from the first day of the school year, but came to an agreement that it would be best for Janet to settle into her new school environment before having a researcher arrive in her classroom. Kathie's proposal for doctoral research was written with input from Janet several months after they began their collaboration. Kathie's proposal continues:

> Since November 1992, I have been working with Janet in her classroom two days per week. In the four months that I have been in her classroom, watching her teach and making field notes, the research design has evolved with input from both the researcher and participant. Janet and I

> have talked about our roles and what we mean by collaborative research. Janet reads all of my notes. There is no separate journal to which she does not have access. Janet also writes in the field notes - her own views, emerging themes or corrections to my notes. We have agreed that she has right of veto over any of the data concerning her teaching, her relationships within the school or anything which she feels is threatening to her. . . . At times I have been a co-teacher in the classroom. . . . I have the opportunity to try different strategies with her students. We often talk about what is "working" and what is "not working" with each of her classes. (Webb, 1993)

The "data" in this study consists of taped interviews (approximately 13 hours), interview transcripts, and several hundred pages of field notes in the form of a research journal completed during the 51 school days Kathie spent in Janet's classroom as a participant-observer and co-teacher during November 1992 to June 1993. Additional sources include: reflections on field notes (by both Janet and Kathie); documents pertaining to Janet's teaching strategies; surveys of parents' and students' needs and interests conducted by Janet in relation to her teaching and her responses to those surveys; documents relating to school policies and events; stories written by both researcher and teacher; and, personal journals sent back and forth between the two partners in this collaborative study. We continued to negotiate the research design and strategies for data collection and analysis even while we were in the process of doing these.

The methodology for this study - *narrative inquiry* - is described by Connelly and Clandinin (1990) as a process of collaboration that involves mutual storytelling and restorying by the participant and researcher as the research proceeds. Connelly and Clandinin stress the importance of mutual

construction of the research relationship, a relationship in which both the practitioner and the researcher feel cared for and have a voice with which to tell their stories. Our interpretation of collaboration and narrative inquiry involves negotiation and involvement by the teacher and researcher at each stage of the research process. For us, analysis of the field texts (Clandinin & Connelly, 1994) was a joint responsibility we commenced as the texts began to be constructed (by both of us) and as we began our reflective conversations. During the fieldwork in Janet's classroom we talked about Janet's teaching, the kinds of findings we were noticing, and our intentions in the collaborative venture, before and after school, during lunch breaks, free periods and on weekends at each other's houses. Since Fall 1993 we have spent many Saturdays in each other's kitchens as co-researchers trying to make sense of the field texts and our reflections and re-reflections on them. Our analysis and choices concerning which stories to tell and how to tell them have been guided by recurring themes or threads in the numerous research stories and key words in Janet's dialogue about her teaching. We have tried to reflect the ongoing construction and reconstruction of our meaning-making over time in our writing about our collaboration (Blond & Webb, In Press).

We have chosen to identify our separate voices in parts of this paper for several reasons. Firstly, we began this research with a commitment to caring for the persons in the study (Noddings, 1986). Kathie, as the person undertaking the doctorate, made a commitment to doing research that would honor and respect the teacher with whom she had asked to work. Her interpretation of caring for the person meant including Janet in decisions at all stages of the research (to the extent that Janet wanted participation and respecting her right not to). Secondly, we wish to emphasize that while we agree on many things we do have separate voices. We acknowledge the power of the researcher to

control the research agenda as well as the interpretations and meanings of the research stories and have tried to find a format for writing which reflects the ways we are trying to challenge the dominant discourse for representation of educational research - that is, through the eyes and words of the researcher. Narrative research methods are currently being critiqued in terms of "academic colonization": the taking and using of participants' stories for purposes decided by, and of benefit to, the researcher (Goodson, 1995). Though we have not completely resolved our dilemmas with the expectations (including format) of academic writing, we are comfortable that in writing her own stories Janet is speaking for herself and has not been colonized as the "other" (Fine, 1994). Part of the social change we are attempting in reporting teacher knowledge and in making epistemological claims for what a teacher knows, includes changing what constitutes "academic writing."

In an earlier paper (Blond & Webb, In Press) we stressed the importance of the teacher-researcher relationship in collaborative research about teaching and described the way trust developed in our research relationship. Relational knowing informs the findings and interpretations of findings in this research. Over the three and a half years that we have been collaborating to understand Janet's teacher knowledge, and as a consequence our personal practical knowledge as teacher-researchers, we have become friends. What we have learned in this study of our knowledge in practice is influenced by being in-relation. In our collaborative work to construct and reconstruct the research knowledge we have engaged in rich, challenging and sustained conversations guided by a genuine sense of mutuality, care and respect for each other and, like Hollingsworth and her (1993) co-researchers, through a passionate and political belief in ourselves and our students as knowledge creators and evaluators. The process of collaborative research we have negotiated is

dependent upon our common respect and valuing of relationship. Our research relationship has allowed an interaction of each of our epistemological bases as teacher and researcher in a manner reflecting the interaction of teacher and student knowing in Lyons' (1990) concept of nested knowing. The manner in which we have come to our findings concerning relational knowing has epistemological import for thinking about how research on teaching is conducted.

A Teacher's Ethic of Care: Grounded in Experience and Relationship

In her analysis of female adolescent constructions of morality, Lyons (in Gilligan et al, 1990, p.41) refers to Kohlberg's dominant model of moral psychology based on justice and resolution of conflict through objectivity and fairness. Lyons reminds us that her own work and that of Gilligan (1982) offer another definition of morality: "that is morality as responsiveness to another." She adds, "This ethic is called the ethic of care or response." While our focus in this paper is a teacher's relational knowing, we see that her desire for relationship and connectedness is part of her ethic of care, an ethic that requires her to be responsive to her students. Janet explains the origins of her ethic of care in teaching as follows:

> Recently someone asked me why I became a teacher. My mother was a teacher, and when I was a little girl, I wanted to be a teacher too, for awhile, until I got into junior high and experienced adolescent behavior first hand. Then I made up my mind, I would never, never be a teacher. I joined the military at 18, partly because I wanted to serve my country. The military didn't work out, because I insisted on pointing out the inconsistencies between what my military instructors "taught" and what they "lived." In my training to be an officer, I felt it was important to care

for the troops, but my superiors did not agree. After my honorable discharge, I had a lot of rethinking to do about my career and one of the things I did was to volunteer at a Catholic college teaching no-cost ESL (English as a Second Language) classes. My class of middle aged and older Asian refugees spoke no English and no interpreter was available to help me. The curriculum started with the numbers. I used sign language, gestures, and facial expressions to communicate with the students. When my interpreter showed up for the first time three weeks later, my students had better pronunciation than he did. That's when I decided to become a teacher.

I decided that I wanted to teach teenagers. I had been a foster kid during my teens, and I felt a responsibility to give something back, because I felt I had benefited so much from my experience. I had also been a "big sister" volunteer during this time, and I thought I understood teenagers pretty well. I took a CHOICES test through manpower, and the computer said, "elementary teacher, shop teacher or Home Ec. teacher," but not junior high. I asked, "Why?" and it said, "Because you expressed an interest in having an impact on other people's lives, and this career doesn't have those qualities." I was glad I had asked. My junior high teachers had a great deal of impact on me, and I knew that the computer was wrong.

Kathie's interpretation of Janet's life stories and why/how caring informs her teacher knowledge provides another layer of meaning. She says:

Janet's ethic of care is grounded in her experiences as a former member of the military, a volunteer teacher . . . in the meanings she has made from her life. Janet's experiences in junior high turned her off her childhood plan of becoming a teacher, and yet her later teenage

experience of being a foster kid caused her to want to "pay something back" because she had benefited so much from the experience. From her own experiences of school and family, she knew that "having an impact on other people's lives" could be positive or negative. Her comment "I felt it was important to care for the troops" reveals her personal commitment to doing work which improves the situations of others. She wants to help people.

In "Composing a Life," Mary Catherine Bateson focuses on the lives of four women she admires ("lives of achievement and caring" 1990, p.10), as well her own, to explore the human experience of relationship. She identifies caring for others and taking responsibility for caring as important life skills - skills which she admits can be learned (p.158-161). Bateson states: "Growing up with the capacity to care for people or communities or ideas depends on the early experience of receiving loving and effective care. . . . Caring can be learned . . . but it requires a base of empathy before internship or residency" (p.159). Similarly, Janet stresses commitment and caring in her life stories. In explaining her philosophy for teaching and in attempting to explain how caring informs knowing in her teaching, she says: "If your intentions are caring, they are more likely to be seen as caring by the student. It is important that students perceive their teachers as caring for them." [2]

---

[2] With Bateson (1990), we question assumptions that caring and nurturing are natural for women, but at the same time draw attention to the effects of women's caring and caretaking in all spheres of human life and work. Bateson's thesis is that women's lives offer valuable models [for caring and for composing a life] because of the pressures [of discontinuity and ambiguity] that make them seem more difficult (p.184). We are aware that feminist theorists (Gilligan, 1982; Belenky et al, 1986; Lyons, in Gilligan et al 1990) have shown that our understandings of care and justice and perceptions of knowledge construction are influenced by theories of human development more reflective of male experience than female experience. We also recognize that as two women engaged in research about teachers' practical knowledge in a profession where more than 60% of teachers are women and where the policies affecting teaching, teacher development and curriculum, are constructed by administrators and policymakers the majority of whom are male, that gender issues abound. However, we are not able to deal satisfactorily with the enormity of these issues within the scope of this paper.

Hank, John and Mary Jane

The following stories concern three of Janet's grade seven students. We have chosen to share these stories because they reveal Janet's caring as their teacher. We argue that her *knowing* from caring and being in-relation influences the curriculum lived-out with each student. Our view of curriculum, not as a document, but as an active process of knowledge construction and reconstruction *with* students in the context of a classroom, emerges from our experiences as teachers and awareness that theorists including Dewey, Schwab, Greene, and Aoki, have long viewed curriculum as something lived-out or enacted with students. We too are concerned with conceptions of curriculum as fixed knowledge delivered by teachers to students (Clandinin & Connelly, 1992). Janet tells her story of "Hank" in this way:

> I got to know Hank early on in the year, as we came head to head over the simple fact that Hank did not want to work in class. I nudged him; I coaxed him; I badgered him; I called his mother; I even kept him after school and spoke to his mother in person when she came to pick him up.
>
> I had often noticed Hank looking at me, as if wondering if I would catch him doing whatever he was up to. The expression on his face seemed sly, somehow. Sometimes he would take other students' binders and hide them, but I was never sure enough about his complicity to hold him accountable. Out of the corner of my eye I sometimes caught him sending swift kicks under the table at one of his classmates. I made a note to myself to watch for further developments and to say nothing. He was friends with two other boys, and it didn't seem to matter how far I separated them, they always seemed to be sharing some private joke. Gradually I began to notice what Hank did better than anything else in class - waste time. I had him in both language arts and math. As report

cards neared, and as some of the assignments came to a close in term 1, I realized he was lagging far behind in completing assignments. I began to put the pressure on. I kept Hank in at lunch. I reminded him frequently to get back on task during work time in class. My efforts at helping him were greeted with hostility. The result of my attempting to hold Hank accountable for his actions resulted in his denial, and a refusal to accept responsibility for his actions. As my pressure on him increased, so did his hostility; and the more I tried to intervene, the more that hostility was directed at me. Finally it reached the point where I kept him after school one day and waited to meet his mother when she came for him.

She told me she was having trouble with him too, and that he was very stubborn. Really! Hank and I reached a temporary truce after that. I knew from experience that there was very little joy in trying to force a stubborn person to do anything. I would try a new approach, and work on convincing Hank of the benefit of getting his work done. Hank didn't seem to care. His first mark in the term was in the 40's, well below what I knew his capabilities to be. Later, when I took my concerns about Hank's performance to my administrator, he informed me that Hank's parents were getting a divorce. Suddenly lights went on. That's why he seems to be so angry at everything, and why his motivation to work is so low. Suddenly I began to see things from Hank's point of view. His world was falling apart. What relevance did anything we were doing in class have to that? When I started to look at what Hank needed, our relationship changed. Hank needed to be left alone. It was part of his healing process. As the days went by, I saw that even though Hank did very little in class, he had a very good understanding of what was going on. He did just enough to get by, he listened to instructions, and his face

displayed understanding. I was even able to joke with him over his lack of work in class. We had an understanding. I acknowledged him, encouraged him, even teased him, but I didn't badger him anymore. There was no point to that. Hank began to smile once in a while. It was as if we shared a secret. He knew that I knew he wasn't doing anything and I knew that he knew I wasn't going to fight with him anymore. He did a little more work here and there pulling his marks up to 50% by the second term, and 55% by the final. It was a healing and regrouping year for Hank. He could have spent most of it either suspended or in the principal's office.

This year I have him in computers and his mark is in the 70's. He comes into class and is always one of the first students to have his disk in his computer ready to work. I have never heard his name called over the intercom to the principal's office, and according to his other teachers, he has settled down considerably and is averaging in the 70's in all his courses.

Janet's story of "John" is also of a student who resists the activities of her classroom and her attempts to teach him - but for quite different reasons. Her story tells of the many things she cares about in being John's teacher. It begins:

I really didn't understand John until I met his mother. She came in for parent teacher interviews, and wanted John to be above average. By third term she was heavily involved in John's work. She was a very concerned parent, but also very controlling. She made up a weekly report card which I had to fill out in detail, concerning John's work, his behavior, and what marks he was getting on his assignments. According to John, and later corroborated by her, she virtually stood over him and made him write for seven hours one Saturday. I began to understand

why John was averse to writing "on demand" which is what I was expecting when I said "Today is a writing day." I decided to give him the space to daydream during language arts class. On the surface it looked like nothing was going on; however, I believed this would be the best way to allow him to create his own writing and avoid having him grow to hate something for which I thought he had a great deal of natural talent. My belief is, forcing someone to do something only gets short term results, lasting until your back is turned. If you allow someone to bring his soul to his work, and to own the process, he is more likely to be internally motivated. When I gave John space in class to think, I realized that it was the only space he was getting for his own ideas. His mother was controlling his time and his work at home. She wanted results. I thought she was stifling his creativity. I felt the best way for him to become independent was to have some freedom and choices.

I saw John's mother as a very caring parent, concerned for her son's academic progress, but felt pulled between the respect I had for her as a mom and what I knew as a teacher. We could both see that he had the potential to be a wonderful writer. But I worried that forcing him to write on demand would make him hate writing to the extent that he would never want to do it again. I thought he needed to be internally motivated to write rather than externally motivated. Nobody can make somebody learn something. My experience as a teacher has shown me that for kids the process of learning involves choices - the freedom to make decisions about their learning. While John's mother and I both had a vision of John as a gifted writer, she did not recognize the process of him becoming a writer involved him having choices.

Our stories of a 13 year old girl in Janet's classroom that year made us both think about the intersection (maybe collision is a better term) of her ethic of care in teaching with the effects of a school policy on individual students. Kathie tells her story of "Mary Jane" in this way:

> Mary Jane was one of the first students I noticed in Janet's classroom. She was taller and bigger in frame than most of the other students in this grade seven classroom, including the boys. I often saw her out of her desk standing over the boys and threatening them. They cowered in her presence. I responded almost instinctively to her off-task and aggressive behavior as the "controlling teacher." Mary Jane responded to me by putting up invisible walls which made it very clear to stay away from her. She did not want me trying to help her or her friends when I was in the room. Without words she gave me a clear message not to interfere with her.
>
> Over the next few months while in Janet's classroom I heard Mary Jane's name being called over the intercom on a daily basis. The school had a points score system for cooperative behavior of students and Mary Jane excelled as the "bad girl" with a constant negative score. Each day began with her being called to the front office and each day ended in the same way. The intercom was used to constantly remind teachers and students that Mary Jane (among others) was a "bad student." Over the eight months I spent in Janet's classroom I noticed Mary Jane's frequent suspension from classes, and from school, for days at a time - the punishments for her "uncooperative" behavior. In her classroom, Janet tried to interrupt Mary Jane's "bad student" story. She told me how she had worked carefully and slowly to get Mary Jane to trust her. It did not happen quickly.

Janet's story of Mary Jane tells what she knows about this student, why she cares about her, and how she got to know her. Her story begins:

> Mary Jane has been set up to be the bad girl by the school. She is not the type of girl to follow meaningless rules. She is very bright. She has no respect for stupidity in those who are in authority over her. She sees that the messages she is being given are not being followed. I think she sees a certain level of hypocrisy in what is going on in the school. On the one hand the school is saying that academics are important but a kid can be kept out of class for the afternoon for wearing a jacket. When we did life-map stories in language arts during term three, suddenly I knew Mary Jane had a lot of stories to tell. During her interview about her writing progress I affirmed her individuality and showed her that I saw it as a positive thing. I saw that her bad girl behavior could be tapped into positively through her writing. Her experience was acknowledged and affirmed. I let her know that I thought she had something to say and I encouraged her to say it.

After this Mary Jane wrote some remarkable poems full of imagery and emotion. Her poems revealed an amazing maturity and level of understanding for a 13 year old girl. This is the first poem she wrote:

Trapped in a world with no escape,
where evil is your fate.
Slowly evil will consume you, if your
heart has no beat for life.
The evil around you is everywhere to be found,
drugs, sex, crime are only a few.
Somewhere deep inside you there's a beating heart,
Everytime you show love to someone, the beat of your heart
grows louder and louder.

In time you not only have the heart that beats,
but the world around you becomes one heart beat.

We chose to share this poem of Mary Jane's from several that she wrote that were also highly revealing of her intelligence, perception and creativity. Mary Jane's poem reflects what she cares about and why people should care. In a strange, almost haunting way her poem resonates with the kinds of claims about caring that we are making in this paper.

A Teacher's Relational Knowledge

Janet describes each of the students, Hank, John and Mary Jane, as a student with whom a teacher could easily get into a "power struggle." It is important to think about why this teacher understands a power struggle as non-productive pedagogically. She says, " A power struggle takes away choice." In her story about Hank she tells how she "put the pressure on" Hank to work in class, and describes his hostility to her methods. Her major concern in this confrontation was that in forcing Hank to work he refused to be accountable for his actions and she had only been successful in taking responsibility from him. She also explains her second and also unsuccessful attempt to convince Hank of the merits of studying. But Hank did not seem to care. Janet identifies the need to care as necessary to a student wanting to study. It was not until Janet found out that Hank's parents were getting a divorce that she could understand why Hank didn't seem to care about his schoolwork. That knowledge helped her to alter her relationship with Hank and to construct a curriculum for him which recognized his choices about when, and how much or how little to work.

Janet's story reveals what she knows of Hank from observing him, from his responses to her as his teacher, as well as what she knows about him from talking to the principal and his mother. Her teacher knowledge is informed by

all of these information sources and her reflections on why her initial attempts to get him to work in class were unsuccessful. Rather than frame Hank or his attitude as the problem, Janet tries for a more constructive perspective which sees Hank as a decision maker. Working from this perspective she says changed their relationship (and as a consequence his response to learning). Her long term goal is for Hank to take responsibility for his actions, including his decisions not to work. Janet recognizes Hank has some good reasons for not caring, but feels that he if is given the space to heal (from the hurt in his personal life) and to be trusted to decide his own work level, that he will decide to work again. She sacrifices short term goals (completing of all class work) for what she sees as a more important long term goal (Hank wanting to learn).

Janet describes the knowing that developed between her and Hank as she changed how she responded to him (and as he changed how he responded to her): "He knew that I knew that he wasn't doing anything and I knew that he knew that I wasn't going to fight with him anymore." Janet's words describe knowing as an interaction between her and Hank. We suggest that this interaction between Janet and Hank is relational or nested knowing and that it occurs as a result of Janet enacting her ethic of care: an ethic of care founded on giving her students choices and acknowledging them as partners in their learning. Montgomery (1993), focusing on the practice of caring in nursing, explains caring as a communication activity and details communication theories related to caring dating back to 1935 including Gregory Bateson's "relational communication," Buber's (1957) theory of "confirmation" and Mayeroff's (1971) work on "empathy." We find Montgomery's focus on caring as a communication activity useful but "communication" is too simplistic a term for our purposes. We claim that Janet's teacher knowledge is continually constructed and re-constructed through knowing in-relation - knowing that

derives from caring. In her story of Hank, Janet describes how her caring was enacted and communicated to Hank and became part of the knowing that occurred as a consequence. Her knowing in-relation concerns *her knowledge with,* a dynamic enacted between her and in this case, Hank.

A Conflict of Caring Situation

Janet's story of John begins to reveal some of the complexities and the conflicts she faces in caring for her students and enacting a pedagogy informed by her knowledge from relationships. Noddings claims conflict is an inescapable risk of caring. She describes how she cares for both her cats and the wild birds in her garden and reveals a "conflict of caring situation" (1984, p.13). She feeds her cats so well that they will not hunt out of hunger and hangs small bells on their collars. She keeps bird cages ready for victims she is able to rescue. She keeps bird baths and bird feeders inaccessible to the cats. Beyond this she lives with the conflict. Noddings argues that the point is not whether she cares more for cats than birds but in trying to discern the kinds of things she must think about when she is in a conflict of caring.

Janet's story of John also reveals a conflict of caring. She cares about what his mother has to say and respects her concern for John. Janet also cares for John and his natural talent for writing. She cares whether he loves or hates to write. Janet's view is that choices are important to John's development as a writer. She sees his mother as limiting his choices particularly about when to write and for how long. Noddings supports the teacher's actions in creating a learning situation which respects and cares for students having choices about their learning, and is critical of situations which force a child to choose against self. She argues in support of a position that insists the child will learn what he chooses. Noddings identifies the power of the parent or educator in the issue of

student choice and stresses that, "Somehow the child must be led to choose for himself and not against himself . . . not only for his physical self but, more importantly for his ethical self" (1984, p.64).[3]

Janet describes the central focus of her knowledge in practice:

> For me, the relationship with the student is the key. Affirming children makes them feel valuable for themselves. Peck (1978) helps me to explain: "For when children know that they are valued, when they feel truly valued in the deepest parts of themselves, then they feel valuable. . . . This feeling of being valuable is a cornerstone of self-discipline because when one considers oneself valuable one will take care of oneself in all ways that are necessary" (p.24). Sharing responsibility for learning with students is an important part of my role as a teacher, helping and allowing students to make choices about their learning. Affirming the student is an important part of this: Responsibility, affirmation, having choices, and self esteem are all connected. When students feel valued and cared for they make choices that will help them and they take responsibility.

The freedom to choose is an important part of Janet's ethic of care revealed in her comment about John, "I felt the best way for him to become independent was to have some freedom and choices." Greene (1988) stresses that making decisions is central to freedom: ". . . the freedom personally achieved when individuals make decisions they believe to be fully their own" (p.101). Our argument for recognition of the relationship between Janet's caring and her knowledge in practice, her knowing from being in-relation with students, includes the importance she attaches to her students having choices, intelligent and humane choices in their learning. Our stories describe Janet's

---

[3] The generic reference to students as male is Noddings'.

ethic of care as sharing responsibility for learning with her students through allowing students to make choices about their learning. We suggest that the relationships Janet developed with Hank, John and Mary Jane are a result of her ethic of care in teaching.

We suggest that her relational knowing derives from, and is situated in, her relationships with her students. One of the most telling comments in Janet's story of John is: "On the surface it looked like nothing was going on." In reality, a lot was going on. Janet's relational knowing was at work enabling her student's creativity to also be at work. Janet affirmed John's right to choose for himself. In the time she allowed John to "daydream" she suggested he write about the things that were important to him. She knew he needed time and opportunity ("space") to be creative and develop his writing ideas and that his mother's standing over him was limiting his writing ideas. Janet's comments reveal that she values students' thinking in her class, that she realizes it takes time to plan in one's head, that good writing involves thinking about writing. She sees sitting and thinking as constructive use of a student's time.

Unlike Noddings who can live with her conflict of caring for birds and cats, Janet cannot live with the conflict of caring for John as a present and future writer and his mother's mandate that Janet must make John write in class. Janet's ethic of care as John's teacher tells her that it is important whether John loves or hates to write: It is important that he is allowed to choose for self. Janet's knowledge of and with John and other students she has taught who were like him - her relational knowing - causes her to fear forcing John to write will make him hate writing. The importance of this story of John lies with recognizing what might have happened if Janet had ignored her relational knowing and if she had forced John to "write on demand" in her classroom so

that it looked like something "was going on." What might then have been the consequences for John as a learner and a writer?

My Intent Was to Affirm Her

In our stories we have tried in a few words to convey how Mary Jane resisted those people, policies and practices at the school which she perceived as trying to have authority over her in ways which were not respectful of her or what was meaningful to her. Janet observed Mary Jane's resistance to persons in authority and worked toward development of a relationship with her based on trust. Development of that relationship took time and effort. As Janet got to know Mary Jane and to be trusted by her she came to a clearer understanding of the source of Mary Jane's rebellion. Janet reveals some of her relational knowing in her comments about Mary Jane: "She is not the type of girl to follow meaningless rules. . . . She sees that the messages she is being given are not being followed." Janet shares her sense that Mary Jane sees a "certain level of hypocrisy" in the school and supports her observation with the example of suspending a student from class for a dress code infringement.

In explaining how her ethic of care informs her knowledge in practice Janet has said earlier in this paper, "For me the relationship with the student is the key. Affirming children makes them feel valuable for themselves." Janet constructed and reconstructed her teacher knowledge as she came to know Mary Jane. She describes a turning point in her knowing when Mary Jane began to reveal to her what she saw as important in her life: "When we did life-map stories in language arts . . . suddenly I knew Mary Jane had a lot of stories to tell." In affirming Mary Jane's life experiences and in encouraging her to write about them, Janet gave Mary Jane the message that she cared about her. Janet says she affirmed Mary Jane's individuality and "showed her that I saw it

as a positive thing." Janet is describing an incident in which she validates the experience of a student and encourages the student to be a knowledge creator. She is explaining how her caring for Mary Jane helped her to develop a relationship with her that informs, enables and influences how she tries to teach her. We consider her relationship with Mary Jane is the source of her knowing.

Our stories of Mary Jane illustrate the difficulties and dualities students and teachers live and face in schools and reveal some of the complexities involved in developing positive teacher-student relationships which will facilitate learning. Janet shares her insight that Mary Jane is a very bright student. We share her poem in support of Janet's claim. Mary Jane's non-conforming behavior in the school context caused her to be labeled a "bad girl" which was consequently re-interpreted as "bad student." It is relevant that Kathie experienced an unproductive relationship with Mary Jane when she responded to her as the "bad girl" and when she tried to assert her authority as a teacher in the classroom. Kathie assumed responsibility and Mary Jane resisted her by shutting her out. The outcome for Kathie was not being in-relation with Mary Jane and not being able to reach her or to help her to learn. Mary Jane's negative response to Kathie's initial attempts to control her are indicative of what might have been John's response to Janet if she had persisted in forcing him to write in class. Janet, however, took the initiative with Mary Jane to slowly develop a relationship based on trust. Both our stories demonstrate that the teacher and the student contribute to the relationship and to the quality of their relationship.

Noddings (1984, p.4) says: "As we examine what it means to care and be cared for, we shall see that both parties contribute to the relation; my caring must be somehow completed in the other if the relation is to be described as caring." The significance of the two way nature of caring is detailed in

Noddings' explanations of the "one-caring" and the one "cared-for" and in her emphasis on the importance of the response to caring. What both she and Mayeroff have termed "reciprocity" fits with our claim that Janet's caring for her students is part of a dynamic in which her students respond to her ethic of caring as she lives it in her teaching - a dynamic which becomes part of her knowing. Mary Jane responded to Janet affirming her as someone who knows something and to the suggestion that she should write about what she knows.

Janet adds to her story of Mary Jane: "Intent is important. My intent was to affirm her and to let her know it was safe for her to write about what she knew in our classroom. I told her I had high hopes for her." Janet enacted and communicated to Mary Jane an ethic of care which allowed her to form a teacher-student relationship based on trust. Mary Jane responded to being affirmed by Janet by expressing her private thoughts in her poetry. From being in-relation Janet came to know Mary Jane and to know how to teach her to be a knowledge creator. Janet's teacher knowledge is situated in, and stems from, her relationship with Mary Jane.

In putting forward a view of teacher knowledge as knowing in-relation, we recognize knowing as complex and involving multiple ways of knowing, including alternative epistemological theories which recognize knowing as an activity both of mind and body.

Teacher Knowledge: Knowing With Mind and Body

Our accounts of Hank's seemingly unwarranted hostility, John's aversion to writing on demand, and Mary Jane's "invisible," yet very obvious initial wall of resistance, reveal that we (as teacher and researcher) made observations and communicated with students in very complex ways. In her comment, "Hank began to smile once in a while," Janet shares with us a small signal or indicator

that she could tell that her relationship with Hank was improving and that he was happier in himself in the classroom. There is also the message that she sees this response as an indicator that Hank will want to involve himself in learning once more. In her story of Mary Jane, Janet shares her assessment of Mary Jane's intelligence and her reflection on when she discovered how she could tap into the girl's experience and to validate her. We share these examples because we feel they begin to demonstrate how a teacher (and student) knows with mind and body and because we consider relational knowing, nested knowing (Lyons, 1990), and embodied knowing to be connected/interactive ways of knowing. We suggest that our teacher and researcher stories fit well with and support the knowledge claims of Benner (1984) and Benner et al (1987, 1989) in nursing, and also Johnson (1987, 1989) and Connelly & Clandinin (1988) who construe embodied knowledge as part of teachers' personal practical knowledge. Though Varela, Thompson and Rosch (1991) have addressed embodied knowledge from the perspective of human experience and Connelly & Clandinin and Johnson from the perspective of teachers' knowledge (and the implications for teacher development), much still needs to be known about this way of knowing.

Our attention in the remainder of this paper will concern locating our epistemological claims within, or in relation to, existing theories for teacher knowledge.

Returning to Elbaz's Structures for Teacher Knowledge

Elbaz's (1983) theory for teacher knowledge concerns the content of practical knowledge and how practical knowledge is held and used. In considering what *practical knowledge in use* looks like she describes the structure of teachers' practical knowledge in terms of rules of practice, practical

principles and images. These terms are chosen to reflect the relationship of the teacher's knowledge to practice, to the teacher's experience and to the personal dimension. Our findings concur with the knowledge claims made by Elbaz.

Elbaz (1983) explains how a teacher's images serve to structure her practical knowledge of teaching. She argues that a teacher's feelings, values, needs and beliefs combine as she forms images of how teaching should be. Elbaz found the teacher's ("Sarah") knowledge of herself in relation to others a recurrent theme in her interviews. She states that Sarah uses images to extend her practical knowledge in order to give meaning to her work: "She holds a wide range of images which serve to condense various aspects of her practical knowledge" (p.138). Sarah's image of "giving too much and challenging too little" (p.143) refers to the dichotomy Sarah experienced in her relationships with students and the difficulties she sometimes experienced in allowing students to take responsibility for their learning. Though Sarah struggled with the impossibility of following up on all her students, Elbaz says Sarah never-the-less kept track of as many as possible and encouraged her students to approach her. Elbaz states of Sarah: "In her work with individual students . . . she used a therapeutic notion 'unqualified positive regard'" (1983, p.48). Elbaz describes Sarah's overriding concern with making kids happy in her class: "Her concern for the welfare of students pervades all of her statements" (p.123). Sarah's message to students, "I care about you and how you are surviving here" (p.194) reminds us of Janet's ethic of care in teaching.

Janet's *knowledge of* Hank, John and Mary Jane, (and the other 53 students in her two grade seven classes), is based on her observations, her experiences with junior high students, her beliefs, her own life, and her knowledge of these students as individual persons. She shares her knowledge

of Hank, and other Hanks she has taught, in her comment: "Forcing someone to do something only gets short term results, lasting until your back is turned." In her story of John she says, "My experience as a teacher has shown me that for kids the process of learning involves choices - the freedom to make decisions about their learning." Janet draws attention to what the parent did not know or seemed not to value, that having choices is important for students. In her story of Mary Jane she places emphasis on the student's personal experience: "I saw that her bad girl behavior could be tapped into positively through her writing."

In her stories of Hank, John and Mary Jane, Janet stresses the importance she attaches to her students having choices in their learning. She describes her strategies for sharing responsibility with students in decisions concerning their learning. We interpret her emphases, these specifics of her ethic of care (Noddings, 1984), as her rules of practice and the practical principles that inform her pedagogy and her teacher knowledge (reflecting the rules and principles Elbaz describes Sarah using to structure her teacher knowledge).

Knowing In-relation: Caring and Nested Epistemologies

In attempting to explain how we perceive or structure teacher knowledge and how we situate caring within that structure, we find Elbaz's content areas, orientations and structures useful and informing, but limiting. Elbaz's structures are too neat and the boundaries too well defined for explaining the complexity of the relation between knowing and caring that we are attempting. Our stories of Hank, John and Mary Jane tell us that Elbaz's theory of teacher knowledge fits our knowledge claims, but we need to extend her theory in order to make connections between knowing and caring. Our construct of teacher knowledge

as relational and dynamic builds upon Lyons' provisional characterization of the epistemological relationship between students and teachers as *nested knowing*: "that is, students and teachers are considered to have nested, interacting epistemological perspectives" (1990, p.162). With Lyons, we are talking about a teacher's knowing as dynamic and interactive with the knowing of students with whom the teacher is in-relation. What is radical about this view is that an individual's knowledge is no longer conceived of as bounded and separate from the knowing of the other person (with whom they are in relation). When in-relation, when a teacher cares for her students, and when that caring is responded to, the knowing of these two persons interacts in an intersubjective way. Our construct speaks the *space in the middle* between a teacher and student when in relation, the interaction that occurs in that space and the consequences for teaching and learning. The kinds of boundaries we picture for teacher knowledge resemble more the semi-permeable membrane of a living animal cell - with substances (information) flowing in and out at one and the same time. We construe knowledge as dynamic, constructed and being reconstructed in ways that mirror the processes used by a living organism; constantly replenishing its "molecules" and being rebuilt.

Our claim is not that every teacher cares, nor that every student responds to a teacher's caring. Our concern is to demonstrate the level of subjectivity that exists in the relation between two persons (teacher and student) - a level of subjectivity and knowing which involves both bodies and minds. Hence, our definition of knowledge is not limited to what one person knows, but the intersection where the knowing of two persons in-relation overlap and the consequences for student learning (and teacher development) when one of those persons is a teacher.

Conclusion

Understanding teacher knowledge as relational, as interactive or nested knowing, has profound implications for how we think about curriculum and teacher development. Given the current political climate in education and widespread moves toward greater top-down control of curriculum, we wonder what will be the effect of policies and practices that ignore teacher knowledge for teachers such as Janet for whom knowing and curriculum-as-lived derive from an ethic of care and being in-relation with students. We also wonder, what will be the consequences for student learning?

Acknowledgment

The authors are indebted to Dr. D. Jean Clandinin for her advice and challenging questions during the preparation of this paper. Jean encouraged us to think about knowing as in-the-relation. We are grateful to her suggestion that we return to the work of Elbaz and Lyons, a suggestion which helped us locate our epistemological claims within existing frameworks.

Bibliography

Bateson, G. (1958). *Naven.* CA: Stanford University Press.

Bateson, M. C. (1990). *Composing a life.* NY: Plume.

Belenky, M. F., Clinchy, B., Goldberger, N., and Tarule, J., (1986). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice and mind.* NY: Basic Books.

Benner, P. (1984). *From novice to expert: Excellence and power in clinical nursing practice.* Menlo Park, California: Addison-Wesley.

Benner, P., & Tanner, C. (1987). Clinical judgment: How expert nurses use intuition. *American Journal of Nursing 87*(23), p.22-31.

Benner, P., & Wrubel, J. (1989). *The primacy of caring: Stress and coping in health and illness.* Menlo Park CA: Addison Wesley.

Blond, J. M., & Webb, K. M., (In Press). Responsibility and relationships in teacher research and the construction of knowledge: Practitioner and researcher perspectives. In H. Christiansen et al (Eds.), *Recreating relationships: Collaboration and educational reform.* NY: SUNY Press.

Buber, M. (1957). Distance and relation. *Psychiatry, 20,* 97-104.

Clandinin, D. J. (1986). *Classroom practice: Teacher images in action.* PA: Falmer.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1992). Teacher as curriculum maker. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Curriculum,* American Educational Research Association, NY: MacMillan, 363-401.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1994). Personal experience methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research.* CA: Sage. 413-427.

Code, L. (1991). *What can she know?: Feminist theory and the construction of knowledge.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Coles, R. (1989). *The call of stories.* NY: Houghton Mifflin.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1985). Personal practical knowledge and the ways of knowing: Relevance for teaching and learning. In E. Eisner (Ed.), *Learning and teaching the ways of knowing.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Connelly F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1988). *Teachers as curriculum planners: Narratives of experience.* NY: Teachers College Press.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher, 19* (5), 2-14.

Dewey, J. (1937). Democracy and Educational Administration. In *Education today.* NY: G.P. Putnam's & Sons, (1940).

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education.* NY: Macmillan.

Elbaz, F. (1983). *Teaching thinking: A study of practical knowledge.* NY: Nichols.

Fine, M. (1994). Working the hyphens: Reinventing self and other in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research.* CA: Sage. 70-82.

Gilligan, C. J. (1982). *In a different voice.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C., Lyons, N., & Hanmer, T. J. (Eds.). (1990). *Making connections: The relational worlds of adolescent girls at Emma Willard school.* MA: Harvard University Press.

Goodson, I. (1995). *Representing teachers: Identity and context.* Presentation with A. Hargreaves at "Conference on qualitative research in education: Narrative." University of Georgia, GA, January 5-7, 1995.

Greene, M. (1988). *The dialectic of freedom.* NY: Teachers College Press.

Hollingsworth, S., Dybdahl, M. & Minarik, L. (1993). By chart and chance and passion: The importance of relational knowing in learning to teach. *Curriculum Inquiry, 23* (1), 5-35.

Hollingsworth, S., Cody, A., Davis-Smallwood, Dybdahl, M., J., Gallagher, P., Gallego, M., Maestre, T., Turner Minarik, L., Raffel, L., Standerford, N. S. & Manheim Teel, K. (1994). *Teacher research & urban literacy education: Lessons & conversations in a feminist key.* NY: Teachers College Press.

Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination and reasoning.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, M. (1989). Embodied knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry, 19* (4):361-377.

Lyons, N. (1990). Dilemmas of knowing: Ethical and epistemological dimensions of teachers' work and development. *Harvard Educational Review, 60* (2), 19-180.

Lyons, N. P. (1990). Listening to voices we have not heard: Emma Willard girls' ideas about self, relationships and morality. In C. Gilligan, N. P. Lyons, & T. J. Hanmer (Eds.), *Making connections: The relational worlds of adolescent girls at Emma Willard school.* MA: Harvard University Press, 30-72.

Mayeroff, M. (1971). *On caring.* NY: Harper & Row.

Montgomery, C. L. (1993). *Healing through communication: The practice of caring.* London: Sage.

Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education.* Berkeley CA: University of California Press.

Noddings, N. (1986). Fidelity in teaching, teacher education, and research for teaching. *Harvard Educational Review 56* (4), 496-510.

Noddings, N. (1992). *The challenge to care in schools: An alternative approach to education.* NY: Teachers College Press.

Peck, M. S. (1978). *The road less traveled: A new psychology of love, traditional values, and spiritual growth.* NY: Simon & Schuster.

Polanyi, M. (1958). *Personal knowledge: Towards a post-critical philosophy.* Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press.

Polkinghorne, D. (1988). *Narrative knowing in the human sciences.* Albany: SUNY Press.

Scheffler, I. (1977, 1991). *In praise of the cognitive emotions and other essays in the philosophy of education.* NY: Routledge.

Varela, F. J., Thompson, E., & Rosch, E. (1991). *The embodied mind: Cognitive science and human experience.* Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Thought and language.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Watson, J. (1985). *Nursing: Human science and human care.* Norwalk CT: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Watson, J. (1988). New dimensions of human caring theory. *Nursing Science Quarterly, 1* (4), 175-181.

Webb, K. M. (1993). *Teacher knowledge: Stories of experience, practice and caring.* Dissertation and research proposal submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, University of Alberta, Edmonton.

CHAPTER 4

IF YOU LOSE AUTHORSHIP : CONSEQUENCES OF LOSS OF STUDENT AND TEACHER AUTHORITY IN CURRICULUM MAKING

Kathie Webb

> A teacher in search of his/her own freedom may be the only kind of teacher who can arouse young persons to go in search of their own.
> (Maxine Greene, 1988, p.14)
>
> In a democracy, education should prepare each of us to tell our own stories.
> (Pagano, 1990, p2.)

This paper emerges as part of the research literature on "teacher as curriculum maker" advocated by Clandinin & Connelly (1992). These researchers suggest curriculum be viewed as an account of teachers' and students' lives together - "a view in which the teacher is seen as an integral part of the curricular process and in which teacher, learners, subject matter and milieu are in dynamic interaction" (p.392). Extending this view, I argue that in order for teachers and students to live out curriculum they must share in a process of meaning-making based on the experiences of teacher and students, they must share in a process of knowledge construction and reconstruction, and to do this they must share authority (Oyler, 1993). My emphasis is with the possibilities for learning when authority for curriculum making is shared with students. When students see that they have choices in their learning and that their own experiences help to create the curriculum, they see themselves as authors and their learning becomes transformed.

As I write this paper I return to the experience of loss I felt during my teenage years when I increasingly lost choices in my life. I gave up my dreams and locked away in a dark place behind a door in my head my belief that it was possible to author my own life. I notice parallels between authoring one's life

(or not) and curriculum as authored with (or authored for) students. My concern is with the consequences of loss of authorship - in life and in school. I question the sources of educational "authority" that construct curriculum for teachers and students, that deny the authority of personal experience, and in so doing, take away authorship.

Introduction

I am a researcher-teacher engaged in a collaborative study of "teacher knowledge" with Janet Blond, a practising junior high school teacher in Edmonton, Alberta, Canada. The methodology and philosophy guiding this study is narrative inquiry (Connelly & Clandinin, 1990). The teacher narratives and field texts from our study show that for Janet, her practice of giving students choices and sharing responsibility with them (shared authority, Oyler; 1993), is an expression of her ethic of care and her practical knowledge (Webb & Blond, In Press).

In my first interview with Janet (March 1992) she said her philosophy for teaching "was to help kids become independent. . . . so that they have the most choices once they get to a point where they know what those choices are and that they can make those choices." She described recent changes in her teaching that enabled her to express her philosophy and described her students as responding positively. In describing these changes, she said she felt she had imposed walls around her students' writing by limiting their topics, "and so they were only going to the top of that ceiling and not going past that." In order to take away the walls, she told her class, "Write about what you care about." I was puzzled and asked, "And that's what changed it?" Janet said, "I think so. Because they have their own voices coming through in their writing." She paused for a moment, then gave an example: "This little girl that I had, who did hardly anything last term, today showed me two pages of stuff that she had

written about 'boys.' And she is a very low ability little girl, but we took those two pages and we talked about it and we tried to clarify together what her ideas were that she was trying to get out. And we talked about it for a good twenty minutes or so and she went away and I will see tomorrow what she does with it."

I do not know whether I heard Janet's use of the word "choices" that day or if I recognized that her emphasis on students' experiences as a foundation for their creative writing was the same as Dewey's philosophy for learning. I was still coming to understand Dewey. I had not yet read Greene's (1988) work on freedom and the power of possibility. I did understand that through her story Janet was describing the way she worked with students to construct curriculum in her classroom and later we made a connection with Clandinin & Connelly's (1992) description of curriculum making. I do not think I understood explicitly, that Janet was telling me it was through giving her students freedom to write about what they cared about, that their writing had been transformed. But her story of that little girl stayed with me.

My Research Interest in Giving Students Choices

Dewey asked, "What does freedom mean and what are the conditions under which it is capable of realization?" (1938, p.22). For Dewey, intellectual growth required freedom of intelligence. He recognized that the significance of freedom in learning was not widely understood and often confused with freedom of movement. Dewey identified freedom with the power to frame purpose. It is here that giving students choices in their learning and enabling them to position themselves as authors becomes crucial.

Janet knows that giving students choices is important in her practice. As we worked together in her grade 7 classroom I saw this lived out in her practice.

We have written about the kinds of choices Janet allows her students and why (Blond & Webb, Webb & Blond, In Press).

In our research together I wondered why I kept going back to the story of the little girl. Why did I as researcher keep focusing on giving students choices? Why did her emphasis resonate with me? I return to my stories of my life history in order to respond. I explore my own identity. My experiences as teacher and researcher and in my gendered life - as girl, adolescent and woman - influence how I see myself and, hence how I teach, how I do research, what I "find" and the meanings I make of those "findings." With Kathleen Casey (1993) I recognize the politics of teachers' personal identity, that the way the teacher feels, thinks, and acts is associated with the way she grows up. Casey wonders why these critical dimensions are washed out of educational research. Acknowledging my position and contributions in this collaborative research, I extend Casey's thesis on the politics of identity to include the educational researcher and draw attention to what has been considered my "irrelevant past."

Exploring the Researcher's Identity: My Personal and Narrative Knowledge

Dewey's view that educators should respect all sources of experience strongly influences my teaching and research. His philosophy of an organic connection between education and experience seems relevant not only to constructing curriculum with students in classrooms, but also to research by and with teachers. Just as teachers and learners are storytellers and characters in their own and other's stories in schools and classrooms, the researcher engaged in the phenomenon and method of narrative inquiry with a teacher/s is also a character in the research story. In this vein, I claim my knowledge and

experience, as teacher, researcher, and woman, as vital contributions to the research knowledge .

Connelly & Clandinin (1988), Johnson (1987, 1989), and Grumet (1987) draw on Polanyi's (1958) theory of personal knowledge to emphasize the importance of the personal in constructs of teachers' personal practical knowledge. Similarly, the personal knowledge of researchers engaged in studies of "teacher knowledge" deserves attention, especially so when the methodology is a narrative one. This claim conflicts with a long history of viewing the researcher's subjectivity in research as contamination (Peshkin, 1988; Phillips, 1990). For Polanyi (1958), however, scientific knowledge is influenced by the person (or persons) who created it: by their beliefs, passions, meanings and ability to articulate how and what they know. He rejects claims to objectivity in science and emphasizes the personal involvement of the knower in all acts of understanding. Polanyi explains the integral nature of the personal in the creation of knowledge as follows: "We must now recognize belief once more as the source of all knowledge. . . . No intelligence, however critical or original, can operate outside such a fiduciary framework" (p.266).

Heeding Polanyi, I move Casey's claims about the politics of teachers' identity into an epistemological realm drawing connections between my identity and my personal knowledge, as a teacher and researcher of teacher knowledge. I draw on theories of narrative knowing - *that our stories reveal who we are and how we are making sense of the world* - (Polkinghorne, 1988; Connelly & Clandinin, 1990; Coles, 1989) to suggest that my stories are connected to and reveal how I make sense of my experiences. That is, my personal knowledge and narrative ways of knowing influence how I construct my practical knowledge as a teacher and researcher. Through my narrative knowing, I explore my life to learn how the stories I tell relate to and inform the

texts of the research in which I am engaged. My teacher knowledge and my research knowledge draw from my life, my reflections on life experiences and the meanings I continue to make.

Authoring, Authority, and Authorized Curriculum

In thinking critically about curriculum I draw attention to *authorship* and the inherent dialectic between *authoring* and *authority*. An *author* is commonly thought of as a writer of a book, books, or articles. In this paper I use the word *author* in terms of *authoring* one's life or curriculum. I examine issues of *authoring* versus *authority* as these relate to teachers and students engaged in curriculum making (Clandinin & Connelly, 1992) as a shared and social process of meaning-making in classrooms. My purpose is to address the implications of students having choices (or not) in their learning, as well as teachers having choices in their teaching, and to argue that freedom to position oneself as *author* is crucial for students and teachers engaged in an active process of curriculum making. The importance of having choices - for students and teachers - is the focus of this paper and central to a conception of *authorship*. My concern is with the possibilities for learning that emerge when students recognize themselves positioned as *authors* and with the consequences of loss of *authorship* for students when curriculum is *authored for* them. Further, and linked to this issue, I express concern at the consequences of loss of authorship for teachers when curriculum decisions are made for them by an external *authority*.

This discussion causes me to question who/what has *authority* for the construction of curriculum. Clandinin & Connelly (1992) help me to think about the origins of an *authorized* view of curriculum as fixed knowledge, a prescribed document or course of study. These researchers argue that curriculum has

come to be construed as an instrument of educational reform and teachers are positioned as mediators (the conduit) between the curriculum and intended outcomes. The *authority* of this view of curriculum contrasts with the lack of recognized *authority* of teachers and students, in school systems or in the research literature, for creating curriculum.

I question ways in which society, school systems and teachers decide/*author* curriculum for students. I raise for concern the kinds of *authority* in schools and society that work to support an *authorized* view of curriculum and to deny students the *authority* of their own experience. I acknowledge that sometimes teachers *author* curriculum for students. Equally, curriculum gets *authored* for teachers, denying their knowledge and experience. The *authorized* view of curriculum also denies the authority of the teacher's knowing and prevents the teacher from being positioned as author. In such a view curriculum becomes a means of control, an *authorized* view of knowledge that denies the experiences of students and teachers.

Reflecting on My Life: Authoring My Identity, My Knowing

I turn now to my narrative knowing to provide a context for this discussion of the consequences of loss of student and teacher authority in curriculum making. I draw on my life history because of the relevance of my experiences to the topic. Also, to emphasize that my identity and the ways I make sense of my experiences influence my research and my teaching. I tell two life stories, stories of experience as a child and as a teenager. I am aware that the reader will see more than I thought I had told. I tell the first story because it speaks of my belief in myself as author of my life. I tell the second story because it speaks of my adolescence and how I increasingly lost choices in the face of my parents'

authority. I lost choices and my feelings of freedom. Consequently I lost my belief that I could author myself as artist.

Sue Middleton's writing encouraged me to write about my childhood. Born in 1947, she was five years older than me. She liked Bob Dylan too and the words of injustice that threaded through his songs "Joey" and "Hurricane" sang in my head as I read about her teenage years and remembered mine. I identified with her cultural and school experiences - an education which did not question the "rightness of colonialism" or the prevalence of racism we had grown up with (1993, p.21) - she in New Zealand and I in Australia. When she talked about her schoolgirl drawings, her dreams, wishes and fantasies, of discovering the world through paintings and of seeing herself as the artist, I knew that dream. Then she added, "Although being a professional full-time artist was not financially possible for women like me" [a rural daughter of the petit bourgeoisie] (p.26). Could this be true . . . that her life and mine were full of the same aspirations and loss of choice? I realized this was something about which I had long remained silent. I read more about her love of music, about what she cared about, but her story disappeared and though the print on the pages remained, in my mind I moved into my story. I began to remember what I have always cared about and when I had seen myself as the artist.

I care about freedom and having choices. I care about having the freedom to author my own life and whether my children and my students have such freedom. When I began to ask myself where this came from I found myself writing stories about the ocean, about going fishing with my father, about growing up on beaches. I felt puzzled, but affirmed, that this fairly recent articulation of my philosophy for life and teaching seemed not new at all. I had recovered something that had to do with my identity: something I had lost a long time ago as a teenage girl. My belief in myself. My story begins. . .

Freedom to Author

I learned about freedom during my childhood. I learned to love freedom. From when I was six years old my family spent a month each Christmas camping at a small bay on the edge of a much larger bay, Jervis Bay, on the south coast of New South Wales, Australia. The surrounding headland was a flora and fauna reserve and the only buildings were the lighthouse and keeper's residence atop the cliffs where the larger bay, eleven miles long and eight miles wide, opened to the Pacific Ocean. It was, and remains, a place of spectacular beauty, of bush, never-ending coastline, white sandy beaches, and the cleanest, bluest water imaginable. For a whole month every year I ran free in this beautiful place spending long hot summer days unsupervised, building hideouts in the bush with other children, swimming and having adventures. I saw myself as having adventures. I read zillions of books and frequently hopped into them with the characters, living a whole new life in my imagination, just as I did in the space and creativity offered by the outdoors. I made friends with the waves, the sand, the trees and the sky. I saw myself as part of this bigger creation and the shapes, the sounds, and the smells, merged with my soul and became part of my identity. From a very early age I had a sense of place, a sense of space and I knew where I fitted. Gregory Bateson has talked of "the pattern which connects" (1972, 1979, also cited in Capra, 1988). I grew up knowing I was part of a pattern - a beautiful and magical pattern much, much bigger than me. I felt wondrous just to be a part.

It may be hard for someone whose childhood was not like mine to understand what freedom means to me or the ways I know that my identity - who I am, how I make sense of the world, my personal dreams, my sense of self - was forged by my childhood experiences. So I will tell of just one day in my life as a child, one special day, a lucky to be alive day, lucky to live such a life. . .

Late in the afternoon my father would often take my mother, my two sisters and I out in his boat to fish for silver bream along the cliffs below the lighthouse. The sea was often calm at that time of day and the waves would gently roll in hit the cliffs and then come back to meet us. I remember one particular day when I was about eight years old. We sat there at sunset bathed in the golden light reflected between 400 foot walls of orange-yellow sandstone and the smooth rolling surface of the water. Dad told me stories about when he went fishing with his father and his adventures when he and his family had moved during the depression to Huskisson, a small fishing community. Suddenly brought out of my reverie by a tug on my line I pulled it in madly, delighted when a small silver bream flipped over the edge of the boat landing at my feet jumping and flicking water everywhere, light flashing from its scales. All the while my little sisters slept on the spare life-jackets under the bow, rocked to sleep in a marine cradle. When the sun began to sink lower on the horizon across the far side of the bay Dad started the motor and we headed for home.

We were moving in a boat on a surface of water where I could see mountains and beaches in the distance, rocks and cliffs nearby, the sky and clouds above. But I knew this to be only one world - the world above the ocean. I saw us as sitting on the interface between two worlds. Below me for hundreds of feet there was another world, full of fish and sharks and all kinds of other creatures (and not forgetting plants), living, interacting, and communicating. That world fascinated me and frightened me. I knew my father did not have complete control over our safety. I'd seen the water change when a southerly blew up. I'd been out there on days when the wind came across the glossy surface towards us turning the water mean and dark and threatening. I'd seen waves spring out of nowhere, lifting the boat and tossing us and trying to throw us to our graves. I knew we were really at the mercy of the ocean and that on

this beautiful, wonderful day, she was merely being kind to us . . . so long as we respected her.

We headed across the bay towards the headland where our tent sat among the trees. Bright pink flying fish called Flying Gernets zoomed across our path showing off their electric blue wings in the last rays of the sun. They were a kind of magic to me - so beautiful, so alive, so free. I imagined myself bright and free like them.

Loss of Authorship, Loss of Self

During my teenage years, however, I experienced a profound loss of freedom. From about 13 onwards, my mother wanted to know where I was all the time. I wasn't allowed to go anywhere alone. I had to be supervised. I did not understand why I had less freedom as a teenager than as a child. It didn't make sense. My whole world was different and I didn't know why. It seemed to me that I wasn't allowed to have any fun. I thought my parents didn't trust me and I didn't know why. I wondered what I had done. My mother often gave as a reason "Because I said." At other times both parents said "Because you are a girl." I didn't get it. My experience of childhood freedom conflicted with that gendered rationale. I'd always been a girl and that hadn't made any difference. Until 13 I was treated the same as a boy. With short hair and a slim undeveloped body I even looked boyish. I couldn't understand that my loss of freedom had anything to do with being a girl.

As the eldest of three girls, my parents thought it funny to tell me their stories of hoping for a boy. I was supposed to be "Christopher," their first born son. It saddened me that I wasn't what they wanted. My brother Craig was born in my first year of high school - the long hoped for son. I turned to my imagination and tried not to think about what being a girl meant.

I was in love with art and art history and thought of myself as an artist. I spent many hours lost in my imagination walking through the streets of ancient Greece admiring temples and sculptures - the work of other artists. I loved to read about ancient Egypt and in particular the lives of the pharaohs and their wives. I coveted their jewelry and their wonderful designs. I read about other artists, collected pictures of paintings, sculptures and architecture from prehistoric to modern times. I marveled at the talent of Leonardo and Michelangelo but wanted to paint like the Impressionists. Somehow I started to lose my belief that I could this.

In school I was learning about 19th century eclecticism, functionalism and organic design. I wanted a career that flowed from my childhood exploration of the beaches and bush. I wanted the freedom of open space and the solitude of design. I knew that I wanted to be an "organic" designer. Secretly I dreamed of being an architect like Frank Lloyd Wright. I wanted to build houses that merged with the landscape like his "Falling Water House." My father was a builder and his father a builder before him, but there was no expectation that I would also build houses. My parents had pinned their hopes for the next builder in our family on my baby brother. It would have been outrageous to mention that I wanted not simply to build but to design houses. An architect? An architect required a university education and no-one in our family, either on my father or my mother's side, had been to university. My sisters and I were not to aspire to such things. "It's just a waste of money to educate girls. You are only going to get married," said my father, defining my future. I also remained silent because my father saw architects as a nuisance to builders like himself. He disparaged the work of architects, saying their drawings were impractical and non-functional. He could not see that a building could be built to be beautiful. I kept my secret to myself and my high school art

book, crammed with pictures and my notes and drawings, became the place in which I lived out my dreams. Somewhere between 14 and 18, bit by bit, I gave up my dream of being an architect.

Despite the overt messages that I should limit my goals for life, I remained a dreamer for a time. My parents encouraged me to learn to sew. I switched my goals to being a fashion designer delighted I had found something sure to appeal to my parents. But no, fashion designing was not a reliable source of income and despite a vocational guidance report which said that this was the career for me and that I had talent, I lost my argument with my parents and my belief that this was something I could do. I trimmed my hopes for my future a little further and decided that I would like to be a jewelry or a shoe designer. I filled books with my designs and drew shoes and decorative bracelets and rings all over my school books. "No!" said my parents. "You will never make it in that field." There didn't seem to be anything else that I could do.

The closer I edged to 18 the more it seemed that I lost opportunity to have any choices in my life. My father said I could be a nurse, a secretary or a shop assistant or teacher (the government was paying teacher trainees scholarships to go to college). I hadn't given any thought to being a teacher. I wanted to be an architect, a designer, an artist. I wanted to create beautiful things. I trimmed my dream down some more, figuring that at least as an art teacher I could pursue my interest in art. My parents scoffed and said no. I applied for a teacher's college scholarship to teach Textiles and Design. I became a teacher so that I could leave home and begin to take control of my life. It was a choice I made having lost a lot of choices.

Freedom, Authorship, and Curriculum

I see parallels between my stories - of the presence and loss of freedom during my childhood and teenage years - and curriculum. My stories concern the consequences of loss of choices in my life. The story I scripted for myself as artist was silenced by my parents. I draw an analogy with the way the authority of mandated curriculum serves to deny students and teachers the authority of their experiences. I wonder about the consequences for students and teachers when curriculum - *what is worth knowing* - is decided/authored for them.

At this point I turn to three studies of teacher knowledge and curriculum in order to further explore the consequences of loss of student and teacher authority in curriculum making: my research with a grade 7 teacher (Blond & Webb, Webb & Blond, In Press); Oyler's (1993) research in a grade one classroom; and Olson's (1993) research with two teacher education students. These studies address the significance of students having choices in their learning and issues of authoring and authority as they relate to curriculum in teaching and teacher education. The implications of authoring - specifically students sharing authority for construction of curriculum - in each of these studies are profound. I suggest there are strong links between the findings of these studies and the themes of my personal stories.

Shared Responsibility in a Grade 7 Classroom (Blond & Webb)

In the collaborative research Janet Blond and I have been engaged in for over three years, the issue of "giving students choices" has figured heavily throughout our conversations and writing. In our first research interview, Janet described sharing responsibility (authority) with students. Later, in her classroom I observed her multiple attempts to share responsibility with her students by negotiating topics, seating plans, discipline, assessment and decisions generally. Her students were given choices about; when to work, to

do group or individual work, doing and handing in homework, to read or write, getting started, where to sit, and whether to work in groups, pairs or alone. Her students were also given choices about being involved in decisions concerning appropriate classroom behavior and responses to inappropriate behavior. I often heard her say to students, "I trust you to make responsible decisions about your work. You are responsible." In her creative writing classes Janet used multiple strategies of classroom talk, brainstorming, and "life-maps," as well as her own personal stories to get her students thinking, talking and writing about their experiences. She said, "I tell them that their experiences count . . . both on a practical and an emotional level, their feelings count." She described her approach as follows:

> I believe in sharing responsibility for a number of reasons. It is a way to increase student thinking and independence. Also, if a student has significant input into what is being studied, the subject matter is more relevant to her/him, and she/he has more ownership in the process. Sharing responsibility is a way for me to let my students know that I care about them. I care that they enjoy what they're doing, and I care enough to consult them. It is a way for me to affirm their expertise and to acknowledge that they do know something and to give them an opportunity to build on what they know. Shared responsibility is a way to acknowledge students' increasing maturity and allows them to be trusted to do what's best for them.

Janet's students responded positively to shared authority (Oyler, 1993) and to being positioned as authors in their learning. Over the course of the school year her students increased their negotiation with her in both language arts and math classes. It became common practice for her students to negotiate their intended work for a class and to make decisions about which aspects of

their work would be included for assessment. Encouraging students to take some authority in their learning, however, was not easy for Janet. In the social, educational and school context in which she worked there were overwhelming messages to students that they had little or no authority and that their experiences were of little consequence. Within her school the intercom frequently came on during lessons and individual students were named for their bad behavior, called to the office, or ordered to get to class. On a regular basis the students were reminded of the school's, the administrators' and the teachers' authority over them. Within this context, Janet's efforts to share authority with students were continually challenged. Sharing authority for curriculum making and trying to enable her students to position themselves as authors of their own experiences clashed with other forms of authority. Janet struggled against students' perceptions, school milieu and even self in trying to share authority with students. She said, "I struggle with control. . . I struggle to give up control."

We began to question the contradictions she lived on a daily basis in trying to enact curriculum through encouraging students to value their own experiences and to believe in the authority of their own knowledge. As we tried to understand what all this meant within the context of Janet's classroom and within the broader context of education, my reading of several other studies helped us both to make connections. We were excited to find that Celia Oyler's study with a grade one teacher described the consequences of shared authority for students' learning and recognized the politics of teachers giving students choices.

Shared Authority in a Grade 1 Classroom (Oyler)

Oyler (1993) argues that if one accepts the fundamental assumptions of Vygotsky's theory of knowledge as socially constructed - that learners actively

construct their own knowledge, that people use language for different purposes in various social contexts and that all learning is social - then these fundamental understandings have consequences for the nature of student and teacher authority and power. She adds, "this then requires that the teacher re negotiate some of her control over classroom procedures" (p. 4). Her study of language learning in a grade one classroom provides a context for understanding "shared authority." She describes the multiple ways the grade one teacher in her study shares authority with students. Oyler stresses that co-construction of meaning is central to this means of making curriculum. She discusses the consequences for students of having choices in their learning: "Sharing authority is not merely offering students activity choices or input into classroom process. Rather, it can be seen as influencing not only the curriculum materials and genres presented to students but the very ways in which students interact with these and make them their own" (p.150). Stressing the possibilities for learning that emerge when students understand themselves repositioned as authors, Oyler argues, "It is only with an understanding of the range of possibilities that exists that students can be seen as making informed choices. The greater the range of possibilities to which they have been exposed, the greater are the students' choices of how they will express their knowledge, understandings, thoughts, beliefs, ideas and dreams; it is in the articulation of these that a power to act exists" (p.158).

In contrast with Oyler's findings concerning grade 1 students' sharing authority for curriculum making, Olson's research (1993, 1995) describes the lack of the authorship for students in teacher education.

Loss of Narrative Authority in Teacher Education (Olson)

Margaret Olson's (1993) research with two teacher education students describes the ways in which the curriculum "authored" by the academy serves

to rob these students of the authority of their own experiences. Her research focuses on the tension between the authority of reason (of the academy/program) and the authority of experience (of students). Olson details the lack of choices for teacher education students in relation to courses and assignments. Both students in her study described the ways they had to fit in and "survive" a program decided for them, but which did not include their meanings or narratives of experience. Olson describes the disturbing consequences as loss of students' "narrative authority," that is, they lost their belief in the importance of their own stories.

Olson's participants shared stories with her from the practicum and from their university classes that were revealing of the ways they were trying to make sense of their experiences. The required assignments, however, did not ask the students for their stories, or to write about or reflect on their experiences. Olson claims that the narrative knowing of the two students was ignored in their teacher education program. One of the students, "Susan," alludes to the authority of the curriculum in her comment that she often felt her professors had a course to cover that took precedence over her needs and interests as a student. She saw that her questions were often discounted and was annoyed when the courses did not provide time to make personal connections with the materials presented. Olson describes the students' lack of opportunity to inquire into their own personal practical knowledge in their teacher education program and argues that the consequence for these students, as they followed the plot lines constructed for them by the academy, was loss of authorship.

Reflecting on the findings of these three studies, I wonder how teachers who share their authority with students can be supported in becoming more articulate about the ways their students are positioned as authors in their learning. I am also left wondering how teachers who do not see what is so

wrong when they and/or school systems position students as receivers of a "authorized" curriculum, or when their students position themselves in ways which deny authorship (Jones, 1991), can be helped to understand the significance of honoring student experience and the having of choices. I turn to Dewey for ideas, as his work on "Experience and Education" is foundational to this discussion.

Authorship and Experience

Amidst all other uncertainties Dewey assumed one permanent frame of reference: "namely the organic connection between education and personal experience" (1938, p.25). Though Dewey is often quoted in educational literature, Greene's (1988) treatise linking freedom and experiential learning shows that his emphasis on experience seems not to be understood by policymakers of the recent educational reform movement. Dewey's criticisms of the kind of experiences students had in "traditional" classrooms in the first third of this century are relevant to the kind of learning experienced by students in the current period of systemic school reform. Dewey asked: "how many [students] lost the impetus to learn because of the way in which learning was experienced by them? How many acquired special skills by means of automatic drill so that their power of judgment and capacity to act intelligently in new situations was limited? How many came to associate the learning process with ennui and boredom? How many found what they did learn so foreign to the situations outside school as to give them no power of control over the latter?" (1938, p.26-27). Dewey said his purpose in raising such questions was not wholesale condemnation of traditional education, but to emphasize that young people in school do have experiences and that the assumption that children come to school without experience is a false assumption. What he saw as important

was the quality of experience and the means by which past experience is employed or enabled to connect and influence later experience.

As a child I learned from experience that the ocean was dynamic, beautiful, powerful and treacherous. I knew that any involvement I was to have with the ocean, whether to swim, play in tidal pools, and most especially, to go out in a boat, required informed choices. I viewed learning not as acquiring fixed knowledge as though it was some finished product, but as a dynamic process that involved relationships, demonstrations and the guidance of adults including my father, multiple and intimate contacts with nature, reading, taking time to reflect, asking questions, and re-reflecting. The continuity of experience described by Dewey, where each experience influences that which has gone before and modifies the quality of those that come after, aptly describes the ways I learned. My story (as well as my research with Blond and Oyler's research) supports Dewey's argument that young people do have experiences that can be used as a ground for their learning and meaning-making in schools.

In advocating the need to respect the freedom of students Dewey also advocated for recognition of the teacher's need for freedom. Dewey understood that in order for teachers to give students choices and to recognize themselves positioned as authors, teachers needed to have choices and to be authors in and of their practice. He understood that when education is based on respect for the students' experiences and the teacher's experiences authority in the classroom changes dramatically. I interpret Dewey as trying to explain the complex ways authority in a classroom becomes changed and shared (Hyde, 1992; Oyler, 1993) among teacher and students engaged in constructivist and/or enactivist (Varela et al, 1993) curriculum making.

Dewey stressed the most important attitude that can be formed in school is that of the desire to go on learning. He stressed that if impetus in this

direction is weakened instead of intensified, something much more than lack of preparation takes place. Dewey described the consequences for students for whom being educated meant a denial of the significance of their own experience. He said: "The pupil is actually robbed of native capacities which would otherwise enable him to cope with the circumstances he meets in the course of his life" (p.48).[1] Dewey questioned the value of students learning prescribed amounts of information. He worried about the consequences.

> What avail is it. . . . if in the process the individual loses his own soul: loses his appreciation of things worth while, of the values to which these things are relative; if he loses desire to apply what he has learned, and, above all, loses the ability to extract meaning from his future experiences as they occur? (p.49)

These are the consequences of loss of authorship. Loss of authorship stems from control of students, denial of students' experiences, and the assumption that what is worth knowing can be decided authoritatively and externally of students. The same consequences exist for teachers when their professionalism, knowledge and experience are denied by an authorized, externally constructed and mandated curriculum for teaching. My stories (as well as Olson's and Oyler's research), provide support for Dewey's concern with the consequences of loss of authorship. At eight years of age I saw myself as author of my own life. I recognized patterns in nature, patterns of birth and death, rhythmic cycles of weather, tide, aging and decay. I felt comfortable about my place in the pattern of things. I saw beauty in both natural and human creations and I wanted to add to that beauty. I believed I could do this because

---

[1] Dewey refers to the student only as male.

at that young age I implicitly believed I was free - free to choose - free to author - my own life. The consequences of loss of choices and loss of freedom in my teenage years were that I lost my belief that I could author my life as artist.

I tell my story because it is not just my story and it is not simply a story of conservative parents. My story is about authority - the kinds of authority that take away authorship and the price that is paid for such a great personal loss.[2] Dewey's writing speaks to me of the contradiction that exists between authority and the authority of experience. When authorities in education including teachers, decide for students what will be learned, when, and how, then students are no longer authors in-or-of their education. The consequences of this are as harmful as Dewey outlined nearly 60 years ago. The greatest risk concerns loss of authorship of one's life - loss of "the ability to extract meaning from his future experiences as they occur" (1938,p.49). The same consequences exist for teachers.

Authorship and Transformation

In Janet's grade 7 language arts classroom I saw her share authority for constructing curriculum with students and I witnessed the transformation that occurred for her students when they recognized for themselves that being able to "write about what they cared about" meant a kind of freedom: that they were authors of their own experience.

---

[2] I recognize the gendered nature of my loss of choices as an adolescent and raise gender as an issue of "authoring." Loss of choices for women and girls in education and life is a real issue well documented in research (Gilligan, 1982; Gilligan, Lyons, & Hanmer, 1990; Brown & Gilligan, 1992; Bepko & Krestan, 1993) and in women's fictional and autobiographical writing, including Zora Neale Hurston, Alice Walker, Virginia Woolf, Charlotte Perkins Gilman, Carolyn Heilbrun, Adrienne Rich, Audre Lorde, Toni Morrison, Magda Lewis, bell hooks. These women writers, and many others, speak of their struggle not only to be artists, writers, poets, playwrights, and academics, but to be other and more, than the narrative scripted for each of them as "woman." For women of color and third world women, loss of choices is not easily separated from issues of race, class (my story too), poverty, or imperialism (Moraga & Anzaldua, 1981). I raise these issues as part of a bigger issue of "authoring" that relates to <u>all</u> students.

The concept of authorship, as it relates to curriculum is described by Greene (1988) in "The Dialectic of Freedom." Greene views knowledge, power, and freedom as linked and makes a connection between constructing one's own curriculum and authoring one's life. She explores what it means to be free - of being able to accomplish what one *chooses*. Greene stresses that it is not only a matter of the capacity to choose, *it is a matter of the power to act to attain one's purposes*. This same emphasis is repeated in the findings of my research with a grade 7 teacher and Oyler's research in a grade 1 classroom. Oyler identifies the possibilities for learning that emerge when students understand themselves to be repositioned as authors. Recognition by students that a range of possibilities exists and they have choices, is key to authorship. Oyler stresses: "It is in the articulation of these that a power to act exists" (p.158).

My story of my childhood sense of freedom describes what Greene has referred to as the "power to act." My story reveals the strength of my sense of self when I trusted in my observations of the ocean and felt that I could act on the authority of my knowledge and experience. In contrast, as a teenager I experienced myself repositioned by my parents' authority. I gave up my story of myself as artist and lost my power to act out that story. My stories help me to think about the way teachers and students get positioned by an authorized (mandated) curriculum and how their "power to act" in teaching and learning is prevented. How can a teacher trust her observations of students and have the power to act in the best interests of each student when the authority of her/his knowledge is denied? How can students positioned systemically as receivers of curriculum ever trust in the authority of their own knowledge and experience? As Dewey has reminded us, freedom concerns the power to frame purpose.

My argument is that when students and teacher have the power to frame purpose in making curriculum, they recognize the authority of their own

experience and see themselves positioned as authors. This realization transforms teaching and learning. Greene (1988) makes the same argument emphasizing that the consciousness of authorship, has much to do with the consciousness of freedom. She argues for a conception of education as a process of futuring, of releasing persons to become different, of provoking persons . . . to take action to create themselves"(p.22). I am drawn to Greene's suggestion that there may be an integral relationship between reaching out to learn to learn and the "search" that involves a pursuit of freedom" (p.124). She says, "Without being 'onto something' young people feel little pressure, little challenge. . . . visible or invisible the world may not be problematized; no one aches to break through a horizon, aches in the presence of the question itself. So there are no tensions, no desires to reach beyond" (124). Greene is describing some of what I know as a teacher - my teacher knowledge. My search for freedom stems from the ways I knew the world as a child. My desire to reach beyond, to break through horizons, is reflected in my words, "We were moving in a boat on a surface of water. . . .But I knew this to be only one world. I saw us as sitting on the interface between two worlds."

In the introduction to this paper, I cited an excerpt of a research interview with Janet that reveals her teacher knowledge of the way authorship works in learning. Janet emphasizes the student as author, "what her ideas were that she was trying to get out. I will see tomorrow what she does with it." The importance of having choices - for students and their teachers - is the focus of this paper and central to a conception of authorship.

In Conclusion

Freedom to position oneself as author is crucial for students and teachers when engaging in an active process of curriculum making. As a researcher,

experienced teacher, and teacher educator, I worry about the consequences of systemically deciding curriculum for students and their teachers. In this paper I bring together my personal experiences as a child and adolescent with studies of curriculum and teacher knowledge in order to help others see the connection I make between curriculum and life. The consequences of loss of choices in education and in life are loss of freedom and loss of authorship - loss of human potential. My question then, is not new. Dewey and Greene, as well as others, have asked it:

What kind of an education is it . . . if you lose the ability to author your own life?

> *Bright pink flying fish called Flying Gernets zoomed across our path showing off their electric blue wings in the last rays of the sun. They were a kind of magic to me - so beautiful, so alive, so free. I imagined myself free like them.*

Epilogue

Towards the completion of this paper I felt compelled to remove my personal stories, fearful of the critique that such writing does not belong in an "academic" paper. Immediately, I saw that to do so would leave me bereft of the examples of how I understood freedom and had come to articulate why the having of choices is important. The irony hit me. How ridiculous, I thought, that if I am to make epistemological claims for my personal knowledge, there is an expectation that I will write without getting personal. Also, if I removed my stories then I lost much of the power of my argument about how lives may be authored and the consequences of an "authorized" curriculum.

Still the reason for my hesitation seemed not to have been addressed. Reading bell hooks' struggle with autobiography helped. I saw the blocks to my own writing in her descriptions of her inability to write, her dread of breaking the secrecy and silence surrounding her family's stories, of being "bound, trapped in the fear that a bond is lost or broken in the telling" (1988, p.156). Like hooks, "I did not want to be the traitor" (p.156). I wondered if my truths would fit those of my sisters, my brother or my parents. I doubt it. Will they understand why I need to tell my story of loss of choices? Will they see that the real issue concerns other people's stories, that as a teacher I am concerned with human potential and the ways education, and I as teacher, might foster or hinder that?

In the spirit of authoring my own story, and in respect for the multiple responses of readers, I close by drawing attention to my intent. A thread unraveled in my stories concerns my teenage loss of seeing myself as an artist. Now, I weave this thread back into the continuing fabric of my life. My story as a teenager was of loss of authorship. Later, much later, through being a teacher, I have come to know myself again as artist and to regain authorship of my life. I am a teacher. The feedback from my students in school and university classrooms tells me of their appreciation for the artistry and passion I bring to my work. The beauty, creativity, originality and thoughtfulness of my students' work tells me that I have helped some in their belief that they can be artists in - and authors of - their own lives. In a more literal sense, I design and create with fabrics and threads. I do not design houses, but have achieved over and over again what I wanted as an adolescent, "to create beautiful things."

Bibliography

Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind.* NY: Ballantine.

Bateson, G. (1979). *Mind and nature.* NY: Dutton.

Bepko, C., & Krestan, J. (1994). *Singing at the top of our lungs.* NY: Harper Perennial.

Blond, J. M. & Webb, K. M. (In Press). Responsibility and relationships in teacher research and the construction of knowledge: Practitioner and researcher perspectives. In H. Christiansen et al (Eds.), *Recreating relationships: Collaboration and educational reform.* NY: SUNY Press.

Brown, L. M. & Gilligan, C. (1992). *Meeting at the crossroads: Women's psychology and girls' development.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Capra, F. (1988). *Uncommon wisdom: Conversations with remarkable people.* NY: Bantam.

Casey, K. (1993). *I answer with my life.* NY: Routledge.

Clandinin, D. J. & Connelly, F. M., (1992). Teacher as curriculum maker. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of research on curriculum.* American Educational Research Association. NY: MacMillan, 363-401.

Coles, R. (1989). *The call of stories.* NY: Houghton Mifflin.

Connelly F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1988). *Teachers as curriculum planners: Narratives of experience.* NY: Teachers College Press.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher, 19* (5), 2-14.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education.* NY: Collier Books.

Gilligan, C. J. (1982). *In a different voice.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C., Lyons, N., & Hanmer, T. J. (Eds.). (1990). *Making connections: The relational worlds of adolescent girls at Emma Willard school.* MA: Harvard University Press.

Greene, M. (1988). *The dialectic of freedom.* NY: Teachers College Press.

Grumet, M. (1987). The politics of personal knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry 17* (3), 474-478.

hooks, b. (1988). *Talking back: Thinking feminist, thinking black.* Toronto: Between the Lines.

Hyde, S. (1992). Sharing power in the classroom. In G. Boomer, et al (Eds.), *Negotiating the curriculum: Educating for the 21st century.* London: Falmer Press. 67-78.

Johnson, M. (1987). *The body in the mind: The bodily basis of meaning, imagination and reasoning.* IL: University of Chicago Press.

Johnson, M. (1989). Embodied knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry, 19,* (4), 361-377.

Jones, A. (1991). *At school I've got a chance.* Palmerston NZ: Dunmore Press.

Middleton, S. (1993). *Educating feminists: Life histories and pedagogy.* NY: Teachers College.

Moraga, C., & Anzaldua, G. (1991). *This bridge called my back.* NY: Kitchen Table.

Olson, M. (1993). *Narrative authority in (teacher) education.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Olson, M. (1995). Conceptualising narrative authority: Implications for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 11* (2), 119-135.

Oyler, C. (1993). *Sharing authority in an urban first grade: Becoming literate, becoming bold.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Chicago IL.

Pagano, J. A. (1990). *Exiles and communities: Teaching in the patriarchal wilderness.* NY: SUNY

Peshkin, A. (1988). In search of subjectivity - one's own. *Educational Researcher 17* (7), 17-21.

Phillips, D. C. (1988). Subjectivity and objectivity: An objective inquiry. In E. W. Eisner, & A. Peshkin, (Eds.). (1990). *Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate.* NY: Teachers College Press. 19-37.

Polanyi, M. (1958, 1962). *Personal knowledge: Towards a post-critical philosophy.* Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press.

Polkinghorne, D. (1988). *Narrative knowing in the human sciences.* Albany: SUNY

Varela, F. J., Thompson, E., & Rosch. E. (1993). *The embodied mind: Cognitive science and human experience.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

Webb, K. M. & Blond J. M. (In Press). Teacher knowledge: The relationship between caring and knowing. *Teaching and Teacher Education.*

CHAPTER 5

AUTHORITY OF TEACHER KNOWLEDGE: AUTHORITY OF SYSTEMIC ASSESSMENT

Kathie Webb and Janet Blond

Introduction

Friday evening May 12, 1995 the phone rings. It's Janet. She is ringing to wish Kathie luck in a job interview. She sounds tired. Kathie outlines the presentation she has planned on "Teacher Knowledge and Assessment" drawing on the ideas discussed earlier with Janet for this paper. Janet listens as Kathie reads field notes, then says:

> *I did something today that perhaps I shouldn't have done.*
>
> What's that?
>
> *Well, I was sitting out in the hall writing with my kids. They said, "What are you writing Mrs. B.?" I said, "I'm writing about why I want to leave teaching." I probably shouldn't have said it. It will get around.*

Janet's comments raise questions for both of us. Why would Janet want to leave teaching? What is happening to her? What does her tiredness and wanting to leave teaching have to do with "Teacher Knowledge and Assessment"? In order to begin our consideration of these questions we commence with our account of her school context and of recent school events. We want to understand Janet's experience because her experience is the paper's focus.

Janet teaches from experience, her own and students' experiences. Her teacher knowledge is constructed from her experience, from her stories and meanings of experience, and from her students' stories and meanings. She works with her students to help them make sense of their lives by talking, thinking, and writing about their experiences. Our three and a half year collaborative study describes how she constructs and expresses her teacher knowledge.

Theoretical Frame: Teachers' Personal Practical Knowledge

This paper emerges from a line of research on teacher knowledge (Elbaz, 1983; Clandinin, 1986; Connelly & Clandinin, 1988; Clandinin & Connelly, 1995) informed by Dewey's (1938) call for education based on a philosophy of experience.

Elbaz's (1983) research with a high school teacher of English literature describes a teacher's *practical knowledge* in terms of rules of practice, practical principles and images. These terms reflect the relationship of the teacher's knowledge to practice, to the teacher's experience and to the personal dimension. Elbaz shows how practical knowledge is social, practical, experiential, oriented to situations and shaped by a teacher's purposes and values. Elbaz argues for recognition of the teacher as an autonomous agent, active in adapting and developing curriculum and shaped by the experiences of her classroom. Clandinin (1986) argues that the accepted view of knowledge, as theoretical and as possessed by experts, denies the experiential knowledge of teachers. Extending Elbaz's theorizing and earlier research on teacher thinking, Clandinin puts forward a view of *teachers' personal practical knowledge.* Her research with two elementary school teachers describes the individuality teachers bring to standard curricula through their beliefs,

experiences and images of what they are doing. Connelly and Clandinin (1988) challenge the taken for granted objective meanings of the word "knowledge" and argue that a teacher's *personal practical knowledge* can be found in the person's past experience, in the person's present mind and body, and in the person's future plans and actions. They draw on Polanyi's (1958) theory of personal knowledge to explain teachers' personal and embodied meanings in educational situations. These researchers introduce narrative as a way of understanding how teachers make meaning from their lives and experiences in school and out. Connelly and Clandinin stress the importance for teachers of understanding their own narratives - their own lives - as a means to understanding students' curriculum.

Alternative epistemological theories are expanding our understandings of teachers' personal practical knowledge: *narrative knowing* (Polkinghorne, 1988; Coles, 1989; Connelly & Clandinin, 1990); *relational knowing* (Hollingsworth et al, 1993); *nested knowing* (Lyons, 1990); and *embodied knowing* (Johnson, 1989). With these researchers and theorists, and specifically the ongoing research of Clandinin and Connelly (1995), we argue that teachers' knowledge is embodied, narrative, relational, autobiographical, and informed by the continually changing contexts of teachers' professional and personal lives.

Research into teacher knowledge challenges the separation of theory from practice. When a teacher's practice is seen as an expression of her/his knowledge, the distinction between practice and theory becomes blurred.

Our Argument: Loss of Authority of Teacher Knowledge

In this paper we describe Janet's personal practical knowledge (Clandinin, 1986; Connelly & Clandinin, 1988) of teaching writing in junior high

school classrooms. Her practice of teaching writing is one which *authorizes* students through allowing them to have choices in their learning and encourages them to write about their experiences. Janet shares *authority* (Oyler, 1993) with students both in the development and assessment of their writing. She positions them as authors and her students recognize themselves positioned as *authors*. Janet stresses "time to write" and "continuity" as crucial aspects in her teaching of writing. Her view of "good" writing, however, is negated by the *authorized* view of writing implicit in the mandated externally designed tests her students undertake. In the imposition of these tests, assessment gets *authored* for teachers and students. Janet's knowledge of teaching and assessing student writing is denied by the *authority* of externally designed assessment measures. This bigger story, that is, the *authorized* systemic version of assessment, denies the *authority* of her teacher knowledge and denies the *authority* of her students' experiential knowledge.

We question the assumption that an *authority* external of the teacher can decide whether her students are learning and that how to go about this can be decided without including her. Our concern is with the *authority* of these assessment measures and how these serve to deny teachers and students. We wonder about the consequences for Janet and her students when the assumptions of mandated assessment contradict, as Janet says, "everything she knows about good teaching."

Janet's Teacher Knowledge

Janet's *personal practical knowledge* is experiential, practical, narrative, relational, embodied and shaped by the contexts of her personal and professional life. This means that we have to pay attention to her stories from her life, the stories she tells of her students, the students' stories that she retells,

her relationships with students, and her expressions of her beliefs, passions, and personal philosophy. Her personal practical knowledge of curriculum is of a dynamic process that involves teacher and students making meaning from their experiences within a classroom. Janet's personal philosophy for teaching and ethic of care are formed around her knowledge that students must have choices and share responsibility with the teacher in order that they may learn from their own experiences and see themselves positioned as authors in their learning. She believes that she has to know each of her students as a person for her students to engage in this active process of constructing and reconstructing knowledge, that is, curriculum making (Clandinin & Connelly, 1992). Janet's teacher knowledge is ethical, moral and social.

I think the role of the teacher is often in helping the kids learn to get along with other people - to help people. I try to help them fit into society and to become productive capable members. Social behavior comes in to what I do. I try to help kids have a better life later on.

In an earlier paper we claimed that Janet's teacher knowledge derives from and is situated in her relationships with students (Webb & Blond, In Press). We showed how Janet's ethic of care emerges from a desire for connectedness and relationship in her teaching and that this ethic of care requires her to be responsive to her students. In retelling our narratives about her relationships with three students we argued that her caring and being in-relation informs her teacher knowledge - her relational knowing. We also described Janet's concern with each student's development of a sense of self. In the stories of Hank, John and Mary Jane we described the ways Janet gave these students choices and encouraged them to choose for self. This emphasis on "caring and knowing" supports our claim that Janet's teacher knowledge is constructed from her passion to respond to each student as a person, and to encourage the

development of each person's sense of self. Janet describes what she is trying to achieve with her students: "I try to build confidence. I try to build self esteem."

Our purpose is to describe the complex ways Janet constructs her personal practical knowledge around knowing her students. Her recognition of the need for students to see themselves positioned as authors in their learning is a key construct in her teacher knowledge.

Knowledge of Positioning Students as Authors in Learning

Janet knows students come to school with experiential knowledge that can provide a ground for their learning. She does not see herself as "delivering information." Her students are positioned by her philosophy in practice, not as receivers of her knowledge, but as authors of their own experiences.

I know kids come to school with everything they have got, their problems, their personalities, their questions, their views of anything worth doing. I do not want them to leave all that at home so I can fill up empty cups. I don't believe that is teaching. I believe kids come to school to learn for themselves. I provide an opportunity for them to learn. Some kids choose not to for various reasons. If they do, it is because they need time - their problems are bigger than I can deal with in the classroom.

Janet describes her work as teaching young people to become life-long writers. She distinguishes between a view of teaching writing as teaching subject matter and her own philosophy and practices in teaching students to see themselves as writers. This distinction is crucial to an understanding of her practices as expressions of her knowledge. Her focus is with the student as a person and how writing can affect that person's life. She says, "I try to help kids have a better life later on."

I want writing to be a life-long experience for them. I want them to achieve a long term love of expressing themselves through writing. I want them

to be able to recognize that they do have something to say and that what they have to say is important - that they are important. My hope is that they will read their writing later on and understand themselves better. If they can read this when they are 20 and understand themselves better at 12 or 13, maybe they can write some more when they are 20 and understand themselves better then.

For Janet, writing is not a method or subject matter to be "delivered" to students, writing is a way to express yourself. She sees herself as engaging in a form of communication with her students and as providing opportunities for students to learn and think about communicating with other people and with themselves. Her emphasis is with each student as a person living a life in the present, with experiences in the past and a life to live in the future. She views the satisfaction and sense of achievement that can result from seeing oneself as a writer as important to the development of her students' self esteem. She believes this will stimulate creativity and willingness to take risks in their writing.

Connected to Janet's belief that students "have something important to say" is her knowledge that students bring their experiences to their learning if they have choices and recognize that their own experiences count. Her experience as a teacher has shown her that students are motivated when they recognize themselves positioned as authors in their learning.

Writing is personal. In the long term no kid is going to enjoy writing unless she/he can bring a sense of "self" into it. If I pick the topics, if I tell students what to write about every single time, then they are writing for me and not for themselves. And as soon as I am gone they are going to stop writing.

When a kid writes about what is important to her/him it leaves a little bit of that person on the page. Students value that. They value their writing. That's what I want. I want students to value what they write about. If they feel like writing about Spring I want them to write about Spring. But if a kid feels like

writing about how his (or her) life is so miserable, then that's what I want him to write about because it acknowledges him as an important person. It acknowledges that what these young people have to say is important, that what they have to say can make good writing that other people will want to read and that they can be proud of.

Janet's emphasis is not just that her students do write, but that her students *want* to write - that they enjoy writing. Her expectation is that it takes time for this to happen.

Time and Continuity in her Teacher Knowledge

Janet stresses "time to write" and "continuity of learning over time" as crucial aspects in her teaching of writing. She shapes the learning experiences of her students by emphasizing the following: time to think about an idea, time to "try it on" and struggle with it, time to sometimes reject a concept, time to move to more complex levels of understanding. She knows that it will take time for her to teach a range of strategies to encourage her students to write in a range of genres. She knows it will take time for her students to believe that they can be successful in writing. She often talks about the time it takes for students to learn as "percolating" - time to allow ideas to "percolate." Students' wise use of time includes thinking about their writing and planning in their heads.

I believe in time to learn and I don't think good writing happens in 30 minute deadlines. There needs to be time for reflection; there needs to be time for trying writing on and seeing how it fits. It takes time to learn. It takes time to learn to write. It takes time to see yourself as a writer.

In one of our talks about time and continuity in her teaching, Kathie noted that most of Janet's grade 7 students started doing their best writing at the end of the school year. Kathie said, "It took a whole year for them to become writers and to see themselves as writers."

It does. And that's the nerve wracking part of it. By the end of the year you are just hoping that they are getting it. Some of them get it by the end of the year and some don't get it until the next year.

Time in Janet's teacher knowledge is also constructed from her own experience as an author of changing one's mind about text and meanings in writing. She knows a writer will often reject and rewrite, or think about and later accept a piece of writing. Janet knows she has to teach this aspect of writing to her students and help them through the evaluative process of judging the quality of their writing - even if it is simply to decide, "Is that what I really wanted to say?"

Because she views learning to write as a process, Janet actively seeks continuity in her teaching practice. In choosing teaching strategies she looks for a connected sequence of activities including; talking, planning and brainstorming ideas for writing, as well as the preparation of drafts in different genres. She deliberately employs methods to help students view writing, and learning to write, as a process. She encourages students in daily journal writing and helps them to set goals for writing such as the completion of two to three pages of writing per week. She knows her students understand they must practice to be good at sport or a musical instrument and she stresses to them that practice is also necessary in writing.

Her Narrative and Relational Knowledge

Janet's teacher knowledge is storied knowledge of her experiences. She tells stories about her practice and about her students as a way to have others understand what she knows and how she has come to know. But she also articulates her teacher knowledge of stories as a means of teaching and learning, particularly in relation to teaching writing. Her teacher knowledge is constructed as she observes students and as she lives in-relation with them

(Webb & Blond, In Press). Her relational knowing, her knowledge from being in-relationship with students, informs her of the development in her students' writing.

One boy in my class, Aaron, writes about the monster under his bed. And I can tell that it is about his fears. It is not what you would call a very good poem, but I can hear his voice coming through when I read it. I see him developing as a writer. I see him writing about something that is a real thing in his life and how he always gets blamed for things in his family even though sometimes he had nothing to do with them. Or if he did have something to do with them, he doesn't remember. So he blames it on the monster who comes down and messes up the house while he is in bed. It really rings true. "He gives me bad dreams so I can't go to sleep. He sneaks around my room. He doesn't give a hoot about me." That sounds like Aaron [laughs].

Janet knows that some students need space to write about what is important to them or even to use writing to help them grow through a stage of psychological development.

Destiny's writing was fairly dark and still is fairly dark. She writes about death and about suicide and about pain. I have a sense in some other teacher's class she wouldn't be allowed to write about those things because they are not pleasant and they are not happy. But when she wrote those things she was in grade 8. Sometimes in grade 8 there is a very dark period and kids just have to get through that part of their life.

Janet knows each student in her class. The way she constructs curriculum with each student and the practices she chooses are informed by her relational knowing. Her knowledge of Destiny is revealed as she describes the purpose of Destiny's writing in terms of what she needs to achieve from her writing.

Knowledge That Everyone Can Write

Janet knows everyone can write. When she finds students have self-limiting ideas about who can be a writer she challenges those ideas. She challenges the notion that only a few "gifted" persons in any group will have the ability to write. She tries to open up the possibility for each student that he/she can be a writer. This belief - that everyone can write - is a major framework for her teacher knowledge.

Expressions of Janet's Teacher Knowledge in Practice

Janet's personal practical knowledge is experiential, personal, narrative, relational, embodied and shaped by her view of curriculum as an active process. She knows time, continuity, and positioning students as authors are important in teaching and learning. In teaching writing, Janet knows everyone can write. Her personal practical knowledge is expressed in her teaching of writing.

Janet's interpretation of "Writers Workshop" (Atwell, 1987; Calkins & Harwayne, 1987; Calkins, 1991; Graves, 1983) incorporates strategies learned during her university studies, in numerous inservice courses, from wide reading and from talk with other teachers. As well, she learned from her experiences of trial and error and from the responses of junior high school students over nine years. Most of the methods Janet uses are well documented and commonly used in teaching writing. Our purpose in referring to several of Janet's strategies is to show how her knowledge is expressed in her practice. Our emphasis is on the complex nature of her teacher knowledge at work.

In modeling her writing, telling her stories, encouraging classroom talk, brainstorming ideas for writing, and in asking students for their stories, Janet uses strategies which will reveal writing as a social process to students. She

chooses these approaches to writing to open up the possibility for her students to believe they can be writers. Janet teaches her students to use other writers' writing as frames for their writing; to construct life-maps; to work in groups and share ideas orally; to read and give feedback on other students' writing. Her strategies reflect her knowledge of writing as a process and the importance of time, continuity, and choices as key to her students learning to write and to "seeing themselves as writers." Her students also participate in decision making about classroom practices and assessment strategies. Her negotiation with students is an expression of her knowing the importance of students having choices in their learning and recognizing themselves positioned as authors.

Personal Stories

In her teaching Janet shares personal life stories. She knows she has to trust her students for this to happen. In stories shared in class about her childhood and growing up, her twin sister, her mother and her stepfather, her brother's death, and in reading a Valentine's poem she had written to her husband, she reveals other relationships in her life, how they work and what they mean to her. Her use of personal stories is an expression of her teacher knowledge. She views her own and students' experiences as providing a ground for curriculum making. With her students she tells and retells her stories of experience as a means to helping students make sense of their lives in the past, present and future.

I remember being a child, having no power and not being listened to. In sharing stories from my life I am modeling and affirming, letting my students know that as a child I too had doubts. I hope my stories tell a lot about me and my understanding of the students in my classroom. Kids do not always understand that people do things for a reason. Stories help them do that. Stories are like poems - people can interpret them differently. They are a more

interesting way to learn. Stories also tell a lot that a kid may not be able to interpret at the time of telling. I told a story in my class about a boyfriend named Douglas that I had in kindergarten. My story was about feeling special. Indirectly I wanted to let the kids know that feeling special, and feeling cared for, is important. They might not recognize the significance of my story right away, but maybe they will later in their lives. They will remember the story. I believe they will carry stories with them even if they do not understand them at the time of hearing them. I also share stories with the hope that maybe the kids would use some of these ideas in their writing, and in their lives. I model storytelling about my own life in part to let them know that I think their stories are important.

The stories shared by her and by her students become lived out in the students' written stories and poems. They become lived out in the curriculum enacted in her classroom. Her students make meaning from their experiences through telling about them, writing their stories and using them as a source of ideas for writing. Janet recognizes that her own and students' meaning-making from stories changes over time. She expresses her understanding that there are times in children's lives when things do not make sense to them and other times when they do. *Stories also tell a lot that a kid may not be able to interpret at the time of telling.* She sees stories as a way of helping students to make sense of their experiences as a means of "carrying" the experience through life until there is a time when meaning can be made from a story of experience.

Janet uses "life-maps" to encourage her students to write about their experiences. She has adapted this idea from a book (Kirby & Liner, 1988) recommended in a professional development workshop she attended. Janet constructs a "map" on an overhead transparency of her life using simplistic diagrams to represent her life experiences and explains parts of her life-map to her students. She shows how these provide a list of ideas for her to write about.

The life-maps exercise says to kids, "I care about you. You have something important to say. Your life is important, you are important. You are interesting. You know something." Life-maps help kids to build confidence, give ideas for writing, build on knowledge through an opportunity to reflect on life. It provides an opportunity to see the patterns in life. It is an opportunity to reflect on what's important, what is memorable and why? It gives students something "real" to write about. It is their choice to tell the story represented by the diagram or not.

Janet suggests ideas to help students develop their own life-maps: "first memory, family stories about you, most embarrassing moment, funniest event, best times with your family, worst times with your family, biggest accident." She gives a strong message to her students that their memories are stories, stories that need to be told.

Classroom Talk - a Preliminary to Writing

Janet's use of classroom talk in her teaching is an expression of her *personal, experiential, embodied, relational and narrative knowing* and her view of curriculum as a socially constructed process. In her stories shared with students Janet often identifies with children's feelings and the ways adults often deny or ignore children's feelings and knowledge. She told her class one day of her sadness at not knowing her brother, how she only met him once but never really knew him. Janet told her students how angry she felt when he died. Her openness to talking about her stories and feelings is a way of modeling her belief in the importance of stories. Janet encourages her students to respond to her and to each other's stories.

Jennifer wrote a poem about her grandfather. She had never even met him, but she had heard stories about him. He was her mother's father. It came out of class talk and it probably came out after talking to other students in her

group about her grandfather, after sharing these stories. It is a beautiful little insight into her feelings about someone.

. . .I was told he always made me laugh
But would never hold me
He thought I was too delicate
As I stare at the old black & white photo
I wonder who was the grandfather I never knew.

Janet views classroom talk as essential to students perceiving themselves as having some freedom of expression and as a means to developing ideas for writing. She knows writing is a social and communal process (Goldberg, 1986) and encourages her students to talk to each other about their writing and ideas for writing.

Sometimes it could seem like a waste of time or a trip to nowhere to let kids talk about things that are important to them. I think this is important to their self esteem and validation. Knowing that an adult in their lives is interested in their views and opinions is ultra important in helping them developmentally reach toward adult maturity, self esteem and self confidence. I know though, that many people, including the kids, see our little forays into personal stories as a waste of time. The kids think they are getting away without doing any work. I pretend to try to get them "back on task" but that's a test in a way. If the kids are adamant they want to talk, I let them. If the conversation wanes, we go back to the "real work" in the classroom. We negotiate what we are going to do.

Janet knows that what she sees as a necessary use of time to enable students to build ideas, foundations and frameworks for their writing might be viewed negatively by an uninformed observer. *Sometimes it could seem like a waste of time or a trip to nowhere to let kids talk about things that are important to them.* She knows her students have been influenced by a story of teaching

and learning that exists in the bigger picture of education outside her classroom - *students receive information from the teacher* - and sometimes they wonder if they can really be learning if they are "just talking" and telling stories.

Brainstorming Writing Ideas

Janet's use of brainstorming as a strategy for creative writing ideas (individually, in groups and as a whole class) is an expression of her knowledge that students need to have choices. She knows that if she decides the topic her students lose authorship. She knows from experience that if her students write about what they care about, their writing will have personal meaning.

In a particular lesson, Janet and her students discussed laziness and different perceptions of laziness. Several students started talking about parents' perceptions of teenagers and teenagers' failures to keep their rooms tidy. Lara said she did not have time to clean her room. Others expressed their perceptions of the pointlessness of tidying their rooms. Janet tried to get them to understand parents' perspectives. One of the students said she found it a priority to clean her room otherwise her parents came and "snooped through her stuff." The class discussion moved on to setting priorities and to how teenagers might set different priorities for themselves than their parents. Several students told stories about how they were punished for things that were not their fault, such as fights with siblings. Janet asked, "So you think your actions were misinterpreted?" They answered, "Yes." Sonja complained that her mother told her to do her piano practice but when she was practising the piano her mother told her to clean her room. She said, "Then I do not know what to do."

Janet moved to the blackboard and said they would brainstorm writing ideas in their journals. She referred to two handouts on "Tall Tales" issued in

an earlier lesson and students began to call out ideas for "How to get an octopus out of a chair." Janet looked for interesting and unique ideas. One student suggested, "Give him lots of lemonade so that he has to go to the bathroom." Within minutes the students began to shift about in their seats. Janet started to brainstorm ideas for the second handout. She said, "Let's hear your tall tales about 'Why is your room such a mess?'" Again she listed students' original ideas on the board. When the students ran out of ideas she asked them to think about writing poems based on their brainstormed ideas. Janet explained that she wanted them to use repetition in poetry without rhyme. Her students had recently written their first poems using a frame of extended metaphor borrowed from a Langston Hughes' poem. Janet moved her students another step in the process of beginning to write their own poetry. She knew that getting students to believe they could write poetry and getting them to see possible structures to use were both step-by-step processes. She suggested they reword the question on the handout, "Why is your room so messy?" in the voice of one of their parents and then repeat that phrase throughout the poem. She suggested the rest of the poem be constructed from the brainstormed "tall tales" about why their rooms are so messy.

Three days later when Kathie arrived back in her classroom, Janet proudly handed her a sheaf of students' poems. Kathie noticed they were on fancy rice paper, each poem illustrated colorfully. Janet said she was very impressed that her students had grasped the concept of repetition without rhyme and that several students experimented and extended the assignment. Janet stressed that it took her students three days to complete the poem and get to the final draft. She drew Kathie's attention to Darren's poem. He had not repeated the same line about "Why is your room so messy?" Rather, he had built humor into his poem and repeated a theme of being nagged to clean up

his room. A vivid image of the nagging parent accompanied Kathie's reading of his poem.

Expressions of Systemic Authority: The Mandated Test

One morning, a week later, as we walked up the stairs to class, Kathie asked, "Are we doing reading this period?" Janet grimaced and said she had to administer a writing test during the last few days. She was unsure what she would do today and said she would probably give students a choice of reading or writing. She was not impressed by the externally designed writing test. She had little input to the content or timing of it. It was given to her with little warning. Janet said, "I didn't know what to tell my kids - how to explain it. I didn't know whether to say, 'Just forget about what we are doing, this is more important' - or what. I thought about spending some time with them showing them how to do the test. In the end I just let them do it and I thought I would see what happened." Janet was not impressed that the test was administered to three grades and that she had to allocate two hours of lesson time to complete it. The test was an infringement on what she was doing with her class, another message that some authority knew better than she what to teach and how to measure learning.

Minutes later, in her language arts class, Janet discussed with students whether they would read for the whole period, finish the writing assignment, or read for half the period and write for the other half of the period. The class decided to read and write. The students started reading. Janet handed Kathie a copy of the writing test. The instructions began with

You will write an essay based on **one** of the following subjects:

The students have four assigned topic choices. This approach did not fit the work Kathie had seen in Janet's classroom where she spent time helping

students to brainstorm writing ideas. It was implicit in her methodology that students' creativity is not stimulated by "You will write." Janet commented, "I am not sure what the department thinks will be achieved by this. I expect the kids will do very badly." Kathie remembered the wonderful student writing seen in the last few weeks. Janet's students wrote about things important to them. She had not decided for them. She had not begun from a "cold start" as in this test. Each writing activity had been preceded by a brainstorming lesson, the preparation of drafts and a final draft. There was time for thoughts to develop. The poetry on "the messy room" had taken three days to complete and had been preceded by brainstorming sessions on "Tall Tales" meant to stimulate the students' imaginations. The sharing and joint effort was also important to the writing. This test measured writing ability in the wrong way. Kathie looked again at the test and noticed other instructions in large bold letters:

"Your essay must include. . . You must do . . . "

She wrote in the research journal: "What effect will these words, expressed as orders, have on Janet's students? The design and implementation of this test denies Janet's knowledge of the students in her class and denies the curriculum they have been constructing. Janet encourages her students to make decisions and be responsible for their learning, gives them messages that they are knowledgeable about their lives and that their knowledge counts. The test gives a very different message, that what is worth knowing can be predetermined and measured."

Returning to our present analysis, Janet describes the mandated writing test as an interruption to the process of her students' learning to write, an "artificial" assessment.

I needed more time to make this assessment work and to build it into my program. It reminds me of a "smoke and mirrors" lesson I did for my evaluation

for permanent contract. I spent weeks planning and setting up for a "brilliant" lesson which would occur the day of the "visit" and it took weeks for me to untangle myself from it. I had to wind down.

Janet questions the validity of the test in terms of the messages it gives to students about writing, the time it takes her and the students to do the test and get over it. She questions the assumptions about student writing that underpin the test. She has no more confidence in what was measured by the test than she had in what was measured of her practice by the "test" of teacher evaluation. She draws a parallel between the artificiality of what was measured of her practice on the basis of a "performance" for teacher evaluation and the artificiality of this externally designed test. It isn't a "real" test of her students' writing because it does not include, honor or value what is "real" to her students. The mandated externally designed test reduces the complexity of what her students know and how they write about what they know to something simple.

Janet experiences the externally designed and mandated test as problematic in four ways: the test authorizes a particular view of "good" writing; the test authors assessment for teacher and students; the test denies the authority of her teacher knowledge; the test denies the authority of her students' experiential knowledge.

The View of Writing Authorized by the Test

Janet's view of writing authorizes students' ways of making meaning from their experiences. The view of writing authorized by test does not authorize students' experiences. The test requires her students to write on demand, in a short space of time, alone, and in silence, on topics decided for them. The test is designed and mandated on the assumption that what constitutes good writing can be decided externally of students and the teacher. The predetermined time frame for the test is premised on the view that good writing, including planning,

drafts and a final draft, can be completed in a single continuous burst of writing completed on request. The view of writing implicit in the test negates time to think about writing, brainstorming, and practice.

The Test Authors Assessment

The test sends a message that good writing can be done quickly and rewards those who can write the fastest. The test implies a right answer that can be measured - a right way to do things - a right way to write. The grading and ranking of students on the basis of marks earned in the test gives the message that some writers are better than others. The students know they will be graded and ranked (sorted) on the basis of their writing in this test. Test scores give a message that some students are good writers and other students are poor writers. The grading process denies "everyone can write."

The Test Denies the Authority of the Teacher's Knowledge

The test contradicts the messages about "good" writing Janet gives her students. Her emphasis on "write about what you care about," and "good writing takes time" is denied by the authority of the test. The imposition of the test says that an authority knows better than the teacher how to measure what has been learned. The way the test is designed and administered denies her knowing from being in-relation with students and denies the curriculum they have been constructing.

The test discounts relationship. It discounts the relationship between the test-maker and the teacher, the relationship between the teacher and the students, and between the students.

Janet knows positioning students as authors is necessary for the possibility of transformation in learning - the transformation that occurs when students recognize themselves positioned as authors. She knows that she

must also be positioned as author in her teaching and in the assessment of her students' writing.

It's coming in from above. Nobody asks me what I do. Nobody asks me for evidence that my kids are learning. Nobody is really interested in what I have to say. They just go over my head and give my kids a test.

The Test Denies Students' Experiential Knowledge

Janet encourages students to write about "something real" to them and knows the importance of positioning students as authors. In contrast, the test decides for students the topics worthy of writing about. The message to students is that their topics, their experiences and ways of making sense do not count. The test denies students the possibility of bringing in their own experience and denies students' experiential knowledge. Further, in requiring students to write alone and in silence, the test denies the ways they are learning to write.

The test discounts the social process of learning. It makes the students write in isolation. The test also denies the value of checking your writing against somebody else's impressions. It denies students the opportunity to try on their ideas against someone else.

The students' meanings of and needs for time are discounted by the predetermined time-frame for the test. Aitken's (1994) study of students' experiences of test taking reveals students commonly feel they do not have enough time in tests. Her research shows that time is one of the most obvious causes of grief for students in test taking: "Students felt an overwhelming sense of lack of control, [of] hopelessness and despair as the minutes ticked by" (p.114). Janet recognizes that the test denies the reality that on some days students cannot and will not write. The imposition of the test is based on an assumption that every student can write at any time.

What they write in the test is a snap shot of what they were writing that day. So if that was the day that their parents came home and told them they were getting a divorce, or if that was the day their boyfriend or girlfriend broke up with them, or if that was the day they spent the morning in the principal's office because they were in a fight, or if that was the day that they forgot their lunch and didn't have lunch or what ever . . . the test just denies anything happening with that kid right at that moment.

Having described Janet's teacher knowledge and the ways mandated externally designed tests deny her knowledge and students' experiential knowledge, we turn to her knowledge of assessment, mindful of her experience: *Nobody asks me what I do. Nobody asks me for evidence that my kids are learning.*

Janet's Assessment of Writing: Expressions of Teacher Knowledge

The modes by which Janet assesses development in students' writing are clear and consistent. Her articulation of what she looks for in students' writing following brainstorming exercises, in drafts, in the completion of a final draft, and in negotiating assessment with students, is an expression of her teacher knowledge.

In brainstorming, I am looking for jotting down of ideas. If they are thinking about a certain thing, what is it that comes to mind about that? If they are talking about a fishing trip that they went on with their parents, what do they remember about it? What were the details? What made the impact on them? What was the most important part of that trip to them? What do they remember if they were to create a picture to take us all back there? What was the scenery? What were the sights? What were the smells? What are the sounds that they remember? If they are talking about being in West Edmonton Mall on an

exciting ride, what is happening there? I tell them, "If you don't remember it, make it up how it could have been. Make up what you think was there, because you need to create a picture for somebody else so that you can bring them back to where you were - so that you can make them part of a glimpse of your life."

In her ongoing assessment of students' writing Janet looks for different signs of development. She reveals her use of relational knowing in assessment in her comment that she wants to hear the student's voice in his/her writing - a voice she knows and recognizes.

I am looking for feelings. I am looking for pictures that they create with words. I am looking for, maybe, a tone. I am definitely looking for their voice coming through in their writing. I am looking for something that is obviously real to them, that the kid is using his/her own words, that it's not something we have heard in a song. It's something I can tell. I can hear the kid saying it as I am reading it. I can imagine the kid actually saying these words. I am looking for their own voice in their writing as an indication that they are trying to achieve an effect - that they are expressing something that is important to them.

The signs of development Janet looks in her assessment of writing are particular to students. Her assessment depends on knowing students, knowing their voices, and knowing how to recognize when personal meanings are "coming through" in that person's writing. Recognition of such step-by-step growth is an important part of teaching and an expression of a teacher's personal practical knowledge.

In students' final drafts Janet looks for a finished piece of writing in terms of development of ideas and presentation of work.

The final draft should be designed both for the person who wrote it and the audience that is going to read it. It should be free of errors. With grade sevens I make sure that they use the rules of punctuation because I understand

that they are still learning. I tell them, "Once you become a published author then you can break the rules. But you have to know which ones you are breaking before you can break them."

Guidelines for correct grammar and punctuation in final drafts are issued to students in a handout on "Writer's Workshop" early in the school year. However, Janet's students negotiate with her when they want to break the rules in order to create a desired effect in their writing.

I can suggest changes but sometimes students are adamant about how they want their writing to look and sound. They have the final say.

Janet negotiates assessment of writing with her students. She does not like assigning grades and marks even though she is required to by the school and school board. She negotiates with students the creation of a writing portfolio that includes initial ideas, multiple drafts, and final drafts. She knows positioning students as authors requires more than choosing their own writing topics, it requires students having some responsibility/authority in all aspects of learning including assessment. Janet shares authority for assessment with students by including them in decisions about what will be assessed, what constitutes "best work," and even what grades will be awarded. Her practice of negotiating assessment is an expression of her teacher knowledge of positioning students as authors. She encourages students to take initiative and make decisions concerning the appearance and content of the final draft. Janet gives suggestions students might consider and emphasizes that presentation of a final piece is important to someone else wanting to read it.

I expect their final draft to look good - to be professional looking. I expect them to have taken care what their work looks like. I am not going to accept something that looks like it was shoved in a pocket and carried around for a

week. I'm not going to accept something written in pencil. I expect students to have a sense of professionalism about their final work.

I also expect them to take initiative. In most cases, they illustrate their work themselves or get somebody in their group to illustrate it. Not every kid is going to take initiative, but there is an incentive to do their best because we publish their writing and these books go out to the class, to the school, and to the community at large. Not only will these students learn from reading each other's writing, other students will learn from them. The care, creativity, and initiative taken in this work, will continue to inspire others' writing long after the book is published.

Janet's purpose in assessment is to help each student author a better life and make sense of her/his experiences. Her assessment practices are expressions of her teacher knowledge. She assesses student writing in an ongoing manner for diagnostic purposes to see if students are learning and to see what she needs to do to help each student achieve growth as a writer. Her descriptions of her teaching of writing and assessment of writing, fit other teachers' stories (Sapkos, 1993; Craig, 1993; Kover, 1993) that speak to the importance of students' stories, how we learn from life and how assessment in school often conflicts with what teachers are trying to achieve. Janet's rationale for negotiating curriculum and assessment - for sharing authority with students - is described by Hyde (1992) and Oyler (1993) in her research with a grade one teacher. Egan's (1994) research with teachers of seven year olds on the impact of mandated testing in Britain, suggests the purpose of national testing is in conflict with the reasons teachers use tests. This study shows there is no follow-up to mandated tests, no diagnostic implementation as a result of testing: The tests are not concerned with improving teaching and learning. The teachers describe their powerlessness in the face of the mandated tests, the erosion of

their professional confidence, and their frustration with policymakers' lack of understanding of the nature of teaching.

Janet is not alone in experiencing conflict with externally designed and mandated tests. Her conflict is with the denial of the authority of her teacher knowledge and the denial of the authority of her students' experiential knowledge by the authorized curriculum implicit in the test. Janet's assessment of student writing is not "done to," but negotiated with, students because she knows student learning is indicated in the transformation that occurs when students see themselves authoring their learning. She does have "evidence" of her students' learning to write. She is consistent and articulate about the evidence she collects. Janet looks for evidence that shows students see themselves as writers. Her evidence is compelling.

I have kids that come back and show me poems that they have written in grade 8 and grade 9, since they were in my class in grade 7. They continue to write not because someone tells them to. They continue to write because they like doing it.

Conclusion: Phone Conversation (Friday May 12, 1995) Continued

I think I know why I was depressed this week. I had to administer the SLAAT.

The what?

SLAAT The Superior Level of Academic Abilities Test.[1] *A school board test of writing and reading. Last week I had to administer the practice test. The students were given four choices. One choice was write a story about someone who has got a new pet - the pet of their dreams. This week in the real test, they weren't given any choices. They had to write*

[1] Fictionalized title of test.

on the topic, "There was an invention for your home. You are trying to convince your parents to buy it." They had 30 minutes to write.

Here I was telling the kids . . . writing takes time, drafts, it is important to write about what you care about.

The kids said to me [about the test], "What do they want?" They know that what they think isn't important. It is implicit in the test. It is the same message as the principal saying, "I'm going to come and watch you teach. I want to see . . . I am the expert."

I found out yesterday that on Monday the school is hiring subs for the day to teach our classes. I have to mark the test. The criteria are already decided. We have to go with all this shit. The message to teachers is "We don't trust you."

I'm tired.

I'm tired of being controlled.

I'm tired of having to control other people.

I'm tired of having to justify myself to people who don't know anything about what I do.

Bibliography

Aitken, E. N. (1994). *A hermeneutic phenomenological investigation of students' experiences of test taking.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton AB.

Atwell, N. (1987). *In the middle.* Portsmouth NH: Boynton/Cook.

Calkins, L. (1991). *Living between the lines.* Portsmouth NH: Heinemann.

Calkins, L. M. & Harwayne, S. (1987). *The writing workshop.* Portsmouth NH: Heinemann.

Clandinin, D. J. (1986). *Classroom practice: Teacher images in action.* PA: Falmer Press.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1992). Teacher as curriculum maker. In P. W. Jackson (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Curriculum,* American Educational Research Assoc. NY: MacMillan, 363-410

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1995). *Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes.* NY: Teachers College Press.

Coles, R. (1989). *The call of stories.* NY: Houghton Mifflin.

Connelly F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1988). *Teachers as curriculum planners: Narratives of experience.* NY: Teachers College Press.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher, 19* (5), 2-14.

Craig, C. (1993). Remembering Ivan. *Among Teachers 9,* 7-8.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Experience and education.* NY: Collier Books.

Egan, R. (1994). *The implementation of mandated curriculum based testing in England and Wales: Voices from the classroom.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Alberta, Edmonton AB.

Elbaz, F. (1983). *Teaching thinking: A study of practical knowledge.* NY: Nichols.

Goldberg, N. (1986). *Writing down the bones.* Boston: Shambhala.

Graves, D. H. (1983). *Writing: Teachers and children at work.* Portsmouth NH: Heinemann.

Hollingsworth S., Dybdahl, M., & Minarik, L. T. (1993). By chart and chance and passion: The importance of relational knowing in learning to teach. *Curriculum Inquiry 23(1),* 5-35.

Hyde, S. (1992). Sharing power in the classroom. In G. Boomer, et al (Eds.) *Negotiating the curriculum: Educating for the 21st century.* London: Falmer Press.

Johnson, M. (1989). Embodied knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry, 19,* (4), 361-377.

Kirby, D., & Liner, T. (1988). *Developmental strategies for teaching writing.* NH: Heinemann.

Kover, P. (1993). If this is supposed to be English, why are we doing life? *Among Teachers 9,* 9-11.

Lyons, N. (1990). Dilemmas of knowing: Ethical and epistemological dimensions of teachers' work and development. *Harvard Educational Review, 60* (2), 19-180.

Oyler, C. (1993). *Sharing authority in an urban first grade: Becoming literate, becoming bold.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Chicago IL.

Polanyi, M. (1958). *Personal knowledge: Towards a post-critical philosophy.* Chicago IL: University of Chicago Press.

Polkinghorne, D. (1988). *Narrative knowing in the human sciences.* Albany: SUNY.

Sapkos, A. (1993). Beyond the bridge. *Among Teachers 9,* 5-7.

Webb, K. M. & Blond J. M. (In Press). Teacher knowledge: The relationship between caring and knowing. *Teaching and Teacher Education.*

CONCLUSION

> Following John Dewey, I believe that the methods for making sense of experience are always personal. Life and method as Clandinin and Connelly argue . . . are inextricably intertwined. One learns about method by thinking about how one makes sense of one's life.
>
> (Denzin, 1994, p.501)

Janet Blond and I are teachers who have engaged in a three year study of teacher knowledge. We re-present our teacher knowledge in this research in the form of stories of practice within narratives that retell and explore those stories. Our narratives of experience help us articulate the ways we construct and reconstruct our personal practical knowledge as teachers and the ways that our knowing is expressed in practice. Drawing on our narratives and other research in this field, we describe teacher knowledge as experiential, embodied, relational, narrative, autobiographical - that is, as shaped by our lives. We believe, with Polkinghorne, Connelly & Clandinin, Carter, Coles, Paley and others, that narrative is an appropriate format for describing a practitioners' knowing in practice. The storytelling format expresses the narrative ways we make sense of experience.

The collaborative process has helped us become more knowledgeable about our teaching. The findings and implications of this research are twofold: we argue for recognition of teachers' personal practical knowledge as knowledge; and, we argue for collaborative research as an educative process for teachers.

We are aware that narrative research has been criticized as fiction and dismissed as merely telling stories: "It's not really research! Where's the truth if no hypothesis is tested? Which story is the truthful one?" These criticisms and questions have foundation if knowledge is considered only to be objective and if research is thought to be the objective pursuit of a single truth. However,

when knowledge is understood as a socially constructed process (Vygotsky, 1962; Berger & Luckmann, 1966) and all knowledge is both objective and subjective (Code, 1991), then such criticisms lack a theoretical base. Narrative research commences from an assumption that truth is both relative and personal. In our research, we see a more educative question would be "What can we learn from this story?"

A Teacher Knowledge Fantasy

Once upon a time there were two teachers, Janet and Kathie, who decided to do research on their personal practical knowledge. Janet told her principal of their plan and he said "Great! What can I do to help you?" Kathie told her principal and she said, "This is really important." Both principals secured funding for the two teachers to be released from face-to-face teaching two days per week for one year, and one day per week for two more years to engage in an extended study of their practical knowledge as teachers. Their superintendent was also supportive and said, "We want you to author it."

Kathie and Janet began co-teaching in each other's classrooms on alternate weeks. They met each week to discuss their research journals, and to share reflections on their notes, stories about students, and emerging themes. Support at the school level, from other teachers and the principal, encouraged these two teachers as they tried to interpret their research texts and later to co-author papers on their findings. In their schools they were asked to share their stories about practice and ongoing interpretations with other teachers in small and large groups. They incorporated the feedback they received into their continuously evolving research. At Janet's school, in addition to teacher preparation time, time was allocated each week for teachers to engage in conversations with each other about practice, to write, or plan units of work

collaboratively. At Kathie's school, teachers exchanged reflective journals about their teaching and teachers led school-wide discussions on curriculum development and student assessment.

Janet and Kathie invited other teachers, parents and representatives of the school system into their classrooms and explained beforehand how visitors could participate in the curriculum being developed and how to work in supportive ways with students and teachers. Parents and the two school principals often stayed back after class to talk with the teachers. Teacher development expanded in meaning for the two teachers as they reflected on their relationships with students, their collaboration with each other, and as they engaged with parents and other educators in making known their teaching practices and teacher knowledge.

Kathie and Janet conducted research into their practice in a supportive context that provided time, space and funds for their research. Their school systems recognized their collaboration as part of the work of teaching, and as crucial to teacher education. These teachers recognized themselves as authoring their development - authoring their lives. Their teaching was transformed by having choices, by having the freedom to frame their own questions and from knowing that their experiences count outside of their classrooms.

Leaving fantasy aside for awhile, I turn to the issues inherent in a narrative methodology, to what we learned from our collaboration, and to the implications of this research. Much of what I have to say is framed in terms of questions. Following this meta-analysis, reality and fantasy in teacher development are addressed from our experience as two teachers engaged in a study of our teacher knowledge.

A Methodology for Authoring our Teacher Knowledge

"Can educational stories be trusted?" asks Barone (1995) and answers his question in the affirmative. He insists stories can achieve critical significance, can promote emancipatory moments within readers and thereby earn their trust. He suggests that the integrity of what he calls trustworthy stories be honored by publication in education journals. This dissertation presents teachers' stories - my stories, Janet's stories, and our shared stories - retold within narratives that include analysis and retellings of those stories, as well as voices of other educators and researchers taken from the research literature. Are our stories trustworthy? Perhaps trustworthiness is not only in the story but in the intent in telling. As Carter (1990, p.9) asks, "What are our stories told in the service of?" Janet and I tell our stories to try and make explicit, first to ourselves and then to others, what our teacher knowledge looks like and how we use our knowledge in practice. Our concern is not to elevate stories to a position of privilege over other forms of theorizing, but to have teachers' stories of practice included with what counts as theorizing and to show how our stories are both method and data in our inquiry.

At the present time criteria for distinguishing what constitutes "good" narrative inquiry are emerging and being debated. A recent edition of the International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education (1995, Vol. 8, No.1) devotes the entire issue to discussion of narrative inquiry. Two issues relating to the quality of narrative inquiry that emerged in this study with Blond are "fidelity to persons" and "shared authority."

Fidelity to Persons

Trust is a major issue in collaborative narrative inquiry. The development of a trust relationship between the persons engaging in collaborative research is crucial to the process and the findings. In our collaborative inquiry, fidelity to

persons (Noddings, 1986) is interpreted as recognition of the mutual construction of knowledge that has occurred, shared vulnerability, an obligation to respond to stories shared, and continual re-negotiation of informed consent. We were guided by Connelly and Clandinin's (1990) advice in constructing a research relationship in which both practitioner and researcher would feel cared for and have a voice with which to tell their stories. Fidelity to persons also requires that some stories told within the research, important stories that call out to be told, will not be told until a means of telling without risk to the storytellers is found.

Conducting research with a commitment to caring for and being respectful of each other's meanings caused us to develop research methods that would allow us to honor fidelity to persons. Our commitment to fidelity demanded that we share authority.

Shared Authority

Shared authority is an issue that relates to both method/process and voice in collaborative research. It concerns decisions about how the research is conducted and about issues of representation and writing. Denzin (1994) addresses issues of representation in taking research to a public audience and is critical of the single voiced text where only the researcher is heard speaking about or for "Others." He says it is best to let Others do their own talking and advocates a multi-voiced text as means to overcoming this problem (p.503).

In Chapter Two Janet and I described the ways we shared responsibility for the work and decision making involved in this study: by negotiating and jointly collecting data; by collaborating in the interpretation of the data; and by jointly authoring the research texts. We did not share responsibility in ways that were equal. Throughout this study Janet remained a full-time teacher. Hence Mondays to Fridays, September to the end of June, her time was used in

teaching students. Throughout this study I have been a full-time graduate student teaching one university course. Our distribution of labor and responsibilities in the study has reflected these realities of our lives. In writing Chapter Four I began to think about "shared responsibility" and "shared authority" in collaborative research. I wondered how these are different. When Janet and I tried to co-author Chapter Five during June, the most hectic month in her school schedule, I found an answer. Janet was busy in what seemed like 27 hour days, assisting her students in completing their writing projects, creating portfolios, producing a publication of her students' writing, end of year reporting, and two job interviews. We improvised in our writing of the paper by getting her ideas on audio-tape in a weekend meeting. I transcribed the tape of our conversation and developed a first draft for the paper based on the 17 page transcript. We talked on the phone about the paper and met again a week later for Janet to read the draft and make changes. Janet read the paper, made some changes and suggestions on how to improve it. She also drew my attention to a specific sentence and said: "That's not what I said. I wouldn't have used that word. It must be an Australianism." At first, I didn't understand. The problem was invisible to me, but a word, a single word was visible, and jarring to her.

Borland's (1991) experience in writing a feminist interpretation of a story told by her grandmother helped me to think about what happened between Janet and me, and why I needed to pay attention. Borland's grandmother's 14 page letter challenging her researcher interpretation speaks to a participant's feelings of loss of authorial control and misrepresentation in research texts. The text I created was jarring to Janet because she knew I had written a word that was not her word and so it wasn't her voice. If it wasn't her voice, it wasn't her meaning. In this way, Janet showed me that she took shared authorship

seriously. She showed me that shared authorship means the authority of each of our voices must be maintained in our writing. She also showed me that, though we are both teachers, we have cultural differences that are reflected in our language use. We employed a strategy that allowed me to take the bulk of responsibility for getting our ideas into a text form, a paper, at a time when Janet was too busy to write, but that strategy could only be successful in terms of our commitment to shared authority if her meanings, expressed through her words, were present as well as mine.

Nespor and Barber (1995, p.49) come close to this emphasis when they point out that "Composing with the people who are part of your research - seeing them as co-authors and part of the audience for the text - is different than writing about them for other audiences." It is a further step in changing educational research to move from seeing teachers as participants to positioning teachers as co-researchers with authority to decide research focus and meanings of data.

Writing the Text - Writing as Inquiry

Richardson (1994) suggests we turn our attention to writing as a method of inquiry. Janet and I see our research as transformative research. We have been transformed as teachers by our study. Our collaborative writing has been part of the inquiry process and, as such, part of the transformation. We learned as we wrote. The three co-authored papers presented in this dissertation reveal an evolution of the ways we represented voice in our texts - her voice, my voice, our voices as teachers, our voices as researchers. We have used the voice of a storyteller (Polkinghorne, 1995) to help us overcome the barriers of the formats expected of "academic writing." We required a format for writing that allowed us

to express the narrative ways we make sense of experience. Telling stories allowed us to do that.

The issue remains: When do teachers get time to write? Janet's school timetable provides her only three "spares" each week. She uses these three 50 minute periods for lesson preparation and for assessment of student work. Though she is commonly tired at the end of each school day, her writing is done after school in the evening, on weekends and during her holidays. Given the workloads of teachers, issues of "who will write?" and "when?" may constitute "a continuing kind of tension" (Lyons, 1995) for teachers engaging in collaborative research into their practice.

Research Contributions

Arguments for recognition of the authority of teacher knowledge are made in all five papers. The papers are connected in the ways they identify the kinds of school and institutional authority that deny the authority of teachers' knowledge and in the narratives describing teacher knowledge. This research in its methodology, findings and implications, contributes to three fields of study: educational research; teacher knowledge; and, teacher education.

The Research Methodology Literature

Our collaborative research offers a view of research as interpretive, emergent, flexible, constantly re-negotiated and with no clearly distinguished phases. The old, or accepted, story of research with distinct phases - designing of the research focus and questions, entry, data gathering, data analysis, determination of findings, drawing of implications and conclusions - does not fit the conduct of this study. For example, in our study, analysis commenced with our first conversations before any data in written form had been "collected." Recognizing that narrative inquiry is grounded in the anthropological research

methods of Mead, Spindler, Wax, and others, a significant difference to the old story of research (where the researcher decides and interprets data) exists in our inclusion of the participant in decisions about what counted as data and in interpretation of data. This shared authority in research changes the methodology, epistemological frame and findings. In our view of research, relationship is central to method, findings and meanings of data. Narrative research concerns making sense of lives. Our data include stories and retellings of stories. Our meanings and interpretations of the stories changed over time. We used two computers, hers and mine. Conversation, trust and improvisation were central to this research, research partly constructed at Janet's kitchen table and partly at mine.

Our personal knowledge is relevant to the research in which we are engaged. Grumet (1987) suggests that researchers who have been teachers in schools are fascinated with schools for suspect reasons, and that while telling the stories of teachers, researchers hide their own. I have considered Grumet's suggestions and wonder if perhaps educational researchers have been discouraged from paying attention to the influence of their stories because of the still prevalent view of objectivity as the criterion for "good" research - even in qualitative studies. Even as narrative modes of research have begun to include the researcher's experience, criticisms of narrative inquiry such as "narcissism" and "academic colonization" prevail, and tend to work against the disclosure of researchers' personal knowledge.

The Teacher Knowledge Literature

As a result of this research, Janet and I now think differently than we did about classroom practice. We are more articulate about our professional knowledge and about the ways our practice is a form of inquiry that informs our theorizing and knowing. Now we can name the conflicts we have with policies

that come down on us in our classrooms and which we experience as hurtful. We now realize that the denial of our teacher knowledge is denial of our professional identity and damaging to a sense of self. Cheryl Craig's words, "The situations that tear at the heart of my practice are the ones in which I am stripped of voice and agency," (In Clandinin & Connelly, 1995, p.24) speak also to our pain. Our research contributes to an ongoing line of research on teacher knowledge that attempts to show why educational reformers and teachers need to relate to each other .

Clandinin and Connelly's most recent text (1995) helps us situate our research in this field. These researchers use a metaphor of the professional knowledge landscape to develop a way to understand what disturbs teachers about their professional lives. They describe two fundamentially different places on teachers' professional knowledge landscape, the one behind the classroom door, and the other in professional places with others. They draw attention to the epistemological and moral dilemmas experienced by teachers by living in two places on the landscape and by moving in and out of the classroom. My research with Janet Blond presents individual and shared narratives of experience that exemplify the kinds of epistemological dilemmas Clandinin and Connelly describe. My dilemmas with teacher evaluation, Janet's dilemma with school and system failure to recognize the importance of her caring relationships with students, and her dilemma with externally designed mandated tests, reveal the conflict of our professional knowledge as teachers with the "rhetoric of conclusions" (theoretical knowledge stripped from the inquiry that gave rise to it) coming down the conduit in the form of policy (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995, p.7). With these researchers, and their co-authors, we too are concerned with ways in which the professional context for teachers is miseducative and with the consequences for teachers when teacher

knowledge is denied by educational policies. With Clandinin and Connelly, Mishler, Carter, Polkinghorne and others, we argue that attention to teachers' stories of practice is a way to create a professional context for teachers that is educative.

The Teacher Education Literature

With the authors of *Learning to Teach* (Clandinin et al, 1993), we argue for a reinvention of teacher education. We interpret teacher education as ongoing. Our research offers a view of teacher education not limited to teacher "training," but to an ongoing view of teacher development that includes practising teachers.

This research with Blond offers an account of teachers authoring their lives. Our research shows what teachers can produce in a "safe space" (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995). We conducted research in Janet's classroom, but were often too busy to talk about our discoveries and reflections while engaged with her students. But it was more than a lack of time. It was not safe for us to explore our ideas and expose our uncertainties and vulnerability in the public space of the school staffroom, an out of classroom place on the landscape. Our "real" conversations happened in the safety and comfort of her kitchen and mine, and in the safety of our relationship based on trust. We shared our collective experiences and told each other stories that were not safe to tell school administrators, other teachers or sometimes even family. We shared our awareness of the "sacred story of professional development," that teachers "are not knowers who can teach each other; they are learners to be taught by experts" (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995, p.126). This sacred story of teacher development positions teachers as receivers of knowledge from "experts" at the university, from school system appointed "experts" (consultants) at "P. D." days and inservice courses, or from books. In the view of Clandinin

and Connelly, teachers are frequently not free to author their own development within their schools and school systems. That was my experience in Australia and Janet's experience in Canada. Together in our collaborative research we recognized ourselves as creating what Clandinin and Connelly describe as a "competing story" of teacher development.

In authoring our own development, Janet and I position ourselves as knowers. Our research represents a story of teachers' professional development that focuses on the ways in which we make sense of our lives and experiences as teachers. Our story of teacher development commences with our own questions, our stories of everyday events in classrooms and our reflections on those events. Our story is a competing story to the sacred story of teacher development. We are reminded by Pat Hogan's experience (In Clandinin & Connelly, 1995) of the vulnerability of competing stories of teacher development, how they are "tolerated for a time" and then get shut down.

A Teacher Development Reality

During our three and a half year collaborative study, we wrote three volumes of field notes in a reflective journal and collected a filing cabinet drawer full of related documentation. We lost count of our meetings to discuss, plan, prepare drafts, write and rewrite papers for publication and presentation. In the last two years, we presented our research at the University of Alberta and at five national and international education conferences in Canada and the United States. Our co-authored papers reveal the ways we are becoming more knowledgeable about our practice and more knowledgeable about the professional knowledge contexts of schools and school systems, that impinge on our classrooms. The work and time commitment to complete this research has been extensive and, for Janet, she has done this on top of a full teaching

load. She has not been provided with relief from teaching or other school commitments to participate in this study. Despite the obvious work and our evidence that we have become more knowledgeable teachers, our teacher-designed research does not count among the criteria construed as teacher development in the school system. This research is transformative research, but is not counted as professional development.

Janet's involvement in this research is not seen as part of her work or her professional development at school or system levels. Her presentations of papers on her practice at national education conferences matter little in a school system where professional development is decided for teachers. Over the last two years she has applied for a number of "promotions" within her school board. School and system administrators paid little attention to her engagement in a collaborative study about teaching. The papers that we have co-authored and which passed academic review for publication, also do not count as her development. In our view, there is no recognition within her school or school system of the ways in which she has become a better teacher as a result of this research.

Our realization of the lack of institutional support for Janet to engage in a study of her own practice, and the lack of recognition of development, is a major implication of this study. Leslie Minarik, a teacher, describes her experiences in her school district where self-initiated inquiry of any kind by teachers is devalued. She writes:

> No one gives us credit for the research we do. I conducted systematic research all last year, wrote papers, presented at conferences. I applied for professional development credit [for that work] and I was turned down.

> They will give me credit for mentoring another teacher, or for attending a workshop, but not for critically examining my own teaching.
>
> (In Hollingsworth et al 1993, p.26)

Minarik's and our experience exemplify the problems of the sacred theory-driven practice story made explicit by Clandinin and Connelly (1995). In the sacred theory-practice story teachers do not speak UP to the level of university researchers, to policymakers or to system appointed experts: practice does not speak UP to theory. We are disappointed that when teachers do write, no one listens. As Janet said in our first co-authored paper, "Hardly anyone cares what a teacher thinks."

My study with Blond is tied to the completion of my doctoral dissertation. Completion of the dissertation partly fulfills university requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy - a credential that is usually seen to confer "expert" status. The Ph.D. will assist me in job applications as a university professor, researcher, and/or educational administrator. However, I have little expectation that in my former school system my doctoral research will help me be recognized as a better teacher. Teacher development, as I experienced it over 17 years in a state system, and as my former colleagues tell me it continues to occur, is commonly authored for teachers by others in authority considered more knowledgeable. My doctoral research would not be seen as development for me as a teacher.

Emergent Issues From The Research

One emergent issue is the need to examine the institutional boundaries and constraints both at the school and university levels that got in the way of this collaborative process. School system authorities granting "permission" for

teachers to engage in research need to be cognizant of the time needed for co-researchers to develop a relationship and to develop a shared research agenda in collaborative research. Collaborative teacher research needs more than School Board "permission," but also support for teachers in terms of relief from face-to-face teaching in order to interpret data and write reports of the research. The "work" and time commitment required for collaborative research need to be recognized in workload configurations in schools and universities.

A second emergent issue is the need to further explore the moral aspects of teachers' work. Janet and I see our purpose as teachers is to help people, but we have experienced policies and administrative practices that impeded our efforts. The ways the assumptions of educational policy conflict with teachers' moral horizons is examined in the Clandinin and Connelly (1995) text, and as these authors state, this area of study offers much scope for understanding the dilemma-laden nature of teachers' professional lives.

A third emergent issue concerns the politics of teachers having choices in their work and of teachers giving students choices. It is a political act to give students choices, particularly in the current climate of top-down education reform. The consequences of negotiated curriculum and assessment as they affect transformative learning need to be explored. The parallel nature of the consequences of teachers being positioned as authors in development and students being positioned as authors in learning deserves attention.

A fourth emergent issue concerns the overlap in our study with research on gender issues in education, and with girls' and women's development. Janet Blond and I are women teachers with multiple commitments in our lives. While we have not involved male teachers in our work, the ways we manage our lives, what we consider ethical and moral dilemmas, are related to our experiences as girls and women. Gilligan et al (1990) and Brown & Gilligan

(1992) describe adolescence as a crisis of connection and observe that adolescent girls often seem divided from their knowledge. Gilligan (1982), Belenky et al (1986), and Bepko & Krestan (1994) describe similar findings with women. Our research describes our conflict as teachers when the systems in which we work deny our teacher knowledge. Gilligan (referring to her earlier research) says teenage girls and adult women often faced a dilemma of relationship, "Was it better to respond to others and abandon themselves or to respond to themselves and abandon others? The hopelessness of this question marked an impasse in female development, a point where the desire for relationship was sacrificed for the sake of goodness, or for survival" (In Gilligan et al, 1990, p.9). We see teachers, both men and women, positioned in similarly impossible ways by educational policies that deny the importance of relationship and deny teachers and students authorship. The problem concerns denying a sense of self. The hopelessness of this situation and the consequences for teachers and students, deserve serious attention. Clandinin and Connelly (1995) begin to speak to a teacher's professional identity and the deleterious effects of reform policies that rain down on teachers.

Gilligan, speaking to college women's perceptions of the absence of women in the curriculum says, "If women students - half the university population - experience their perceptions or their questions as disruptive, it may be because, in fact, they are so." (In Gilligan et al, 1990, p.6). In Canada, women are more than 60% of all teachers in schools, but very few women or teachers have a voice in educational policy. If the questions that Janet Blond and I ask, as women teachers, are considered disruptive, it may be because, in fact, they are so.

Looking Back

The research findings are strongly influenced by the relationship between the two collaborating researchers. We recognize that replication is impossible. We consider our best advice to those wishing to design similar studies concerns our thoughts on how we might design future research.

Looking back, the decision for one researcher to conduct research with one teacher was not wise. We were too vulnerable. There were no supports for this teacher within her professional context. We had the permission of the school board and the school principal to conduct research in Janet's classroom for six months to a year. But that is permission, not support. In future work, we will engage with a group of teachers. A group offers the possibility of a community of teachers that would support each other during the reflective research process. There would need to be no end to co-teaching they wished to continue. A research group provides support to members as the findings of the research are being taken to a public audience. Janet's teacher knowledge, explored, constructed and reconstructed in our study, is difficult for her to share with colleagues who have not experienced the same long-term reflective process. It is not safe for her to discuss the findings of our research within the context of her school or school system. She feels alone. The papers she has co-authored are unlikely to be shared with colleagues or given credence in her professional knowledge landscape.

In future work we would engage in research on teaching practice through negotiating ongoing administrative support at school and system levels. We would seek a principal who would be supportive of such a study and invite this person to engage with us in the research. Our suggestions might be for the principal to spend time in the classroom with us and the students, to meet with us regularly and informally to talk about our findings, and perhaps to respond to

us and students in a reflective journal. We would invite the principal to make suggestions. We would explain our need for a flexible study design with continuous re-negotiation with all participants, including students and parents. We would negotiate support in terms of time, finances, and recognition for our work as development. We would ask the principal to start thinking about the ways in which our research into practice could be brought into the normal school routine and how the findings of our collaboration could be shared with other teachers in situations that would not set us up as "experts."

We would think about how to make our work part of a new story of teacher development at the school level - development authored by teachers. The principal would be a key figure in making this happen.

Looking Forward

Looking forward, we need to be aware of the current plot line for the story of teacher development. What is needed is a new plot line of teachers authoring their own development. Restating an emphasis from Chapter One, we must be aware of the old story or it will silence the new one.

Writing a new story for teacher development must commence with a view of knowledge which sees practice as connected to and not separate from theory - a view that acknowledges practice as the inquiry that leads to theory (Clandinin & Connelly, 1995). Dismantling what these researchers refer to as the "sacred theory-practice" story, will require changed relationships among teachers, administrators and policymakers, as well as what Lyons (1990) has referred to as a changed logic. The hierarchical distribution of authority that excludes teachers from decisions that affect their practice helps maintain the sacred story. A new story of teacher development requires new structures and policies at the school level that would facilitate and support a process that

allows teachers' meanings of their work to be shared. The institutional boundaries that prevent teachers from conducting research into practice need to be removed and proactive thought given to the ways institutional support can be given to teacher-initiated research. Educational institutions, school systems and universities, need to change perceptions of what counts as research; who is considered a researcher; and what kinds of research will be funded. The language and formats of educational research literature need to change to include teachers in the research community. Most of all in this new story, authority needs to be shared - with teachers - and with students.

I ended the first chapter of this dissertation by quoting Carter's question, "Have we authored our work in such a way that lives have changed for the better?" I used her question to address an imagined audience with the authority and interest to engage with teachers in creating a new story of teacher evaluation that would include teachers' meanings of their work and value teachers' personal practical knowledge. I still find Carter's question useful and ask it: to myself of the three year collaborative study I have engaged in with Janet Blond; to Janet; and to a broader audience of teachers, teacher educators, policymakers, students, parents, educational researchers and others. I find, however, that I need to move Carter's question along a bit. I ask instead: Can we change our conceptions of curriculum, teacher development, and assessment of student learning so that teachers and students might author their lives in ways <u>they</u> consider for the better?

<u>Return to Fantasy: Teachers Authoring Their Lives and Their Development</u>

Janet and I continue to do research in each other's classrooms, and with other teachers, in a supportive environment that values teachers' narratives of experience. Professional development in schools is focused around teachers

engaged in talking, reading, and writing about teaching. Time for teachers to reflect on the meanings of their work and to engage in studies of their teaching practice is accounted for in teaching loads and school timetables. Teachers' understandings of curriculum and student assessment as interconnected continuous processes are made known at school and system levels through teacher designed and led professional development days. The provision of secretarial support at school levels assists us and other teachers to reproduce in text form our articulations of practical knowledge shared in meetings and reflective conversations.

The research literature on teacher development has changed considerably and includes teachers' stories of practice, and reflections on the ongoing meanings of their narratives of experience. Teachers are recognized as engaged in practice and theorizing. There is wide understanding that teachers must have choices and must be positioned as authors in their own development. Changes are made in university and school systems to recognize teachers' development through engaging in studies of teaching practice. Teacher education is redefined as educational institutions recognize and value the collaborative research process itself as educative.

Practice is starting to speak to policy. Teachers' ideas about testing are being tried at system levels. Several schools in Janet's district are implementing a teacher designed test of writing completed over six days and where the students are allowed to talk and help each other!

We go on working in our classrooms and improving our teaching . . .

Bibliography

Barone, T. (1995). Persuasive writings, vigilant readings, and reconstructed characters: The paradox of trust in educational storytelling. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 8* (1), 63-74.

Belenky, M. F, Clinchy, B., Goldberger, N. and Tarule, J., (1986). *Women's ways of knowing: The development of self, voice and mind.* NY: Basic Books.

Bepko, C., & Krestan, J. (1994). *Singing at the top of our lungs: Women love and creativity.* NY: Harper Perennial.

Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise on the sociology of knowledge.* NY: Doubleday.

Brown, L. M. & Gilligan, C. (1992). *Meeting at the crossroads: Women's psychology and girls' development.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Borland, K. (1991). "That's not what I said": Interpretive conflict in oral narrative research. In S. B. Gluck, & D. Patai, (Eds.), *Women's words: The feminist practice of oral history.* NY: Routledge. 63-75.

Carter, K. (1993). The place of story in the study of teaching and teacher education. *Educational Researcher,* 22 (1), 5-12.

Clandinin, D. J., & Connelly, F. M. (1995). *Teachers' professional knowledge landscapes.* NY: Teachers College Press.

Clandinin, D. J., Davies, A., Hogan, P., & Kennard, B. (Eds.). (1993). *Learning to teach, teaching to learn: Stories of collaboration in teacher education.* NY: Teachers College.

Code, L. (1991). *What can she know?: Feminist theory and the construction of knowledge.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (1990). Stories of experience and narrative inquiry. *Educational Researcher, 19* (5), 2-14.

Denzin, N. K. (1994). The art and politics of interpretation. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln, (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research.* CA: Sage. 500-515.

Gilligan, C. J. (1982). *In a different voice.* Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.

Gilligan, C., Lyons, N., & Hanmer, T. J. (Eds.). (1990). *Making connections: The relational worlds of adolescent girls at Emma Willard school.* MA: Harvard University Press.

Grumet, M. (1987). The politics of personal knowledge. *Curriculum Inquiry 17* (3), 474-478.

Hollingsworth S., Dybdahl, M., & Minarik, L. T. (1993). By chart and chance and passion: The importance of relational knowing in learning to teach. *Curriculum Inquiry 23(1),* 5-35.

International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education. (1995). 8 (1).

Lyons, N. (1990). Dilemmas of knowing: Ethical and epistemological dimensions of teachers' work and development. *Harvard Educational Review, 60* (2), 19-180.

Lyons, N. (1995). Re-Imagining teacher education. A review of "Learning to teach: Teaching to learn," by D. J. Clandinin et al (1993). *Curriculum Inquiry* 25 (1) 75-85.

Nespor, J., & Barber, L. (1995). Audience and the politics of narrative. *Qualitative Studies in Education, 8* (1), 49-62.

Noddings, N. (1986). Fidelity in teaching, teacher education, and research for teaching. *Harvard Educational Review 56* (4), 496-510.

Polkinghorne, D. (1995). *Reporting qualitative research as practice.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American educational research association, San Francisco, April 1995.

Richardson, L. (1994). Writing: A method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln, (Eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research.* CA: Sage. 516-529.

Vygotsky, Lev. S. (1962). *Thought and language.* Cambridge, MA: M.I.T. Press.